

# **TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD.**

---

---

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.**

**OCTOBER TERM, 1922.**

**No. 271.**

---

**HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, PETITIONER,**

**vs.**

**ROBERT H. LANGDALE.**

---

**ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE  
OF OHIO.**


---

---

**PETITION FOR CERTIORARI FILED FEBRUARY 15, 1922.**

**CERTIORARI AND RETURN FILED APRIL 29, 1922.**

**(28,711)**



(28,711)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1922.

No. 271.

HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, PETITIONER,

*vs.*

ROBERT H. LANGDALE.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE  
OF OHIO.

INDEX.

	Original.	Print.
Proceedings in supreme court of Ohio.....	3	1
Motion to certify.....	3	1
Petition in error.....	5	2
Waiver of summons.....	6	3
Record from common pleas court of Franklin County.....	7	3
Transcript of docket and journal entries.....	7	3
Petition .....	11	5
Præcipe for summons.....	15	7
Exhibit A—Certificate of membership.....	16	8
Answer .....	34	18
Reply .....	46	24
Report of referee.....	48	25
Motion to vacate report of referee.....	89	49
Motion to confirm report of referee.....	90	50
Record from court of appeals of Franklin County.....	91	51
Transcript of docket and journal entries.....	91	51
Motion for new trial.....	93	52
Bill of exceptions.....	95	53

	Original.	Print.
Stipulation as to submission.....	95	53
Motion for new trial.....	97	54
Order settling bill of exceptions.....	99	55
Testimony of George B. Frey.....	104	58
Exhibit E—Report of C. C. Hall.....	119	61
A—Certificate of membership.....	148	85
D—Special notice of quarterly call.....	167	96
B—Testimony of George D. Fry.....	168	97
A—Blank form of Hartford Life Insurance Co.....	181	105
B—Table of insurance statistics of Robert H. Langdale.....	182	106
C—Safety-fund statistics.....	184	109
Minute entry.....	186	110
Journal entry of judgment.....	187	111
Clerk's certificate.....	188	112
Reporter's certificate.....	189	112
Writ of certiorari and return.....	190	112



1-3

Supreme Court of Ohio.

No. 16834.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff in Error,  
vs.

ROBERT H. LANGDALE, Defendant in Error.

*Motion for Order to Certify.*

[Filed November 16, 1920.]

Now comes the plaintiff in error, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, and moves this honorable court for an order directing the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, Ohio, to certify to this court its record in the above entitled cause, being Cause No. 779 upon the docket of the said Court of Appeals, wherein the said Robert H. Langdale was plaintiff and the said The Hartford Life Insurance Company was defendant, on the following grounds, viz.:

- (1) The case is of public and great general interest.
- (2) Error has probably intervened.

Robert H. Langdale was a member of the Safety Fund Department of plaintiff in error, which does a life insurance business on the assessment plan, and brought this action in equity for an accounting of alleged excessive assessments paid by him to plaintiff in error between the years 1903 and 1919.

The referee appointed by the Common Pleas Court found for defendant in error in the sum of \$847.77, for which amount judgment was entered in that court.

An appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals and the case being there submitted upon evidence, that court on the eighth day of November, 1920, rendered judgment for defendant in error in the sum of \$847.77 and interest, after overruling plaintiff in error's motion for a new trial. The motion to certify is filed in this court within seventy days of the entering of said judgment by the Court of Appeals.

The jurisdictional question herein presented involves the rights of several hundred residents of Ohio, and several thousand residents of other states, members of the Safety Fund Department, and hundreds of thousands of members of other assessment associations in this and other states. This jurisdictional question has never been determined by this court, and the decision of the Court of Appeals establishes the first precedent in Ohio, which is contrary to decisions of the Supreme Courts of the United States and of Missouri and the Court of Appeals of New York in actions brought by members of the

Safety Fund Department. In view of the conflict between the decision of the Ohio nisi prius court with the decisions of the courts above mentioned, and of the importance of the question to the hundreds of thousands of members of similar associations, this court should review the case and establish the rule of law in Ohio applicable to this situation.

JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT AND ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff in Error.*

STATE OF OHIO,  
*Franklin County, ss:*

H. B. Arnold, being duly sworn, says he is one of the attorneys for plaintiff in error, and that the facts stated in the foregoing motion are true, as he believes.

H. B. ARNOLD.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence, this 13th day of November, 1920.

[SEAL.]

A. J. WRIGHT,  
*Notary Public, Franklin County, Ohio.*

Columbus, Ohio, November 13, 1920.

Service of the foregoing motion and its filing is hereby acknowledged.

SMITH W. BENNETT,  
*Attorney for Defendant in Error.*

*Petition in Error.*

[Filed November 30, 1920.]

Plaintiff in error says that at the September Term, 1920, of the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, defendant in error recovered a judgment against plaintiff in error by the consideration of said court, in an action then pending therein, wherein plaintiff in error was defendant, and defendant in error was plaintiff, a transcript of the docket and journal entries whereof is filed herewith.

6 There is error in said record and proceedings in this to wit:

1. Said court erred in overruling the motion of plaintiff in error for a new trial.

2. Said court erred in deciding and adjudging that it had jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action, and in deciding and adjudging that the assumption and exercise by it of jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action was not and is not a violation of the constitutional rights of the plaintiff in error, and was not and is not a taking of its property and a denial to it of due process of law, under and against the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

3. Said court erred in deciding and adjudging that the payments by defendant in error sought to be recovered herein were not voluntarily made, so as to preclude recovery by him.

4. Said court erred in deciding and adjudging that plaintiff in error was barred from recovery herein by reason of the provisions of the statute of limitations.

5. Said court erred in rendering judgment for defendant in error.

JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT AND ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff in Error.*

*Waiver.*

Columbus, Ohio, November 13, 1920.

The issuance of summons in error in the above case is waived, and the appearance of defendant in error is hereby entered.

SMITH W. BENNETT,  
*Attorney for Defendant in Error.*

In the Common Pleas Court, Franklin County, Ohio.

[No. 73527.]

ROBERT H. LANGDALE, Plaintiff,

vs.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant.

*Transcript of Docket and Journal Entries.*

- 1916, November 13.—Petition, affidavit and precipe filed.
- 1916, November 13.—Summons issued sheriff Franklin County, Ohio; returnable November 27; answer December 16, 1916.
- 1916, November 13.—Summons issued sheriff Franklin County, Ohio; returnable November 27; answer December 16, 1916.
- 1916, December 11.—Demurrer and memorandum of defendant filed.
- 1917, April 19.—Amended demurrer filed by defendant.
- 1917, April 19.—Demurrer and amended demurrer both overruled as entry; exceptions.
- 1917, April 24.—Depositions on behalf of plaintiff filed.
- 1918, December 5.—Motion and memorandum of plaintiff filed.
- 1918, December 13.—Ordered that defendant file answer instant as entry.
- 1918, December 13.—Answer of defendant filed.
- 1919, January 4.—Ordered by court that cause be referred to Hon. George B. Okey, referee; exceptions as entry.

1919, January 10.—Reply of plaintiff filed.

1919, November 15.—Objections and exceptions of defendant; report filed and motion to vacate filed.

1919, November 28.—Bill of exceptions from Geo. B. Okey, referee, filed.

1919, November 28.—Report in referee filed.

1920, January 9.—Motion filed.

1920, March 4.—Judgment for plaintiff for \$847.77 and interest from September 1, 1919, and costs, including referee fee for \$250.00; notice of appeal, and appeal bond fixed at \$500.00 entered.

1920, March 26.—Appeal bond filed.

1917, April 19.—This day this cause came on to be heard upon the demurrer and amended demurrer of the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, to the petition of the plaintiff. The same was argued by counsel. The court upon consideration thereof, being duly advised in the premises, doth find that said demurrer and amended demurrer are not well taken, and the same are accordingly overruled. To which order and judgment of the court the defendant, by its counsel, excepted.

Said defendant has leave to plead herein by March 26, 1917.

1918, December 13.—It is hereby ordered that defendant file its answer instanter, which is forthwith done.

9 1919, January 4.—This day this cause came on to be heard upon the motion of the plaintiff for a reference of this cause to a referee to take the evidence of the parties and witnesses; to determine the questions of law and fact involved herein and to state thereon his conclusions separately and the court does find that said cause is one in which the parties are not entitled by the constitution to a trial by jury.

It is therefore by the court ordered that said cause be referred to Hon. George B. Okey, who as such referee is directed to reduce the testimony of the parties and witnesses to writing and to have the testimony thereof subscribed by each witness, unless the signature thereto is waived by the parties hereto.

Said referee further has authority to settle all questions of pleadings in said cause and to permit parties hereto to amend or supplement the pleadings herein if necessary, and that such referee make report to this court under this order without unnecessary delay.

To all of which foregoing orders of said court the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, by its counsel, protests, objects and excepts.

1920, March 4.—This day this cause coming on to be heard upon the report of Hon. George B. Okey, referee herein, and of his findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the objections and exceptions to said report filed by the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, and upon the motion of the plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, to confirm the report of the referee and a decree thereon in conformity to said report.

10 Said cause being first heard upon the said objections and exceptions of the said defendant to said report, the same was argued by counsel, and the court being fully advised in the premises

and upon consideration of the same, doth overrule said objections and exceptions and each of the grounds thereof, to which order and judgment of the court the defendant, by its counsel, excepts.

Said cause was then heard upon the motion of the plaintiff to confirm the report of said referee herein and for a decree thereon in conformity therewith, and the same having been argued by counsel, and the court being fully advised in the premises, finds said report of said referee, in all respects, regular, and the conclusions of law of said referee, in all respects, correct, and said report is approved and confirmed.

And said referee having found and reported on taking an account between said plaintiff and defendant, that there is a balance due the said plaintiff from said defendant, for assessments paid by the plaintiff in excess of the contract rate in the sum of \$847.77, with interest thereon from the first day of September, 1919.

It is, therefore, considered and decreed by the court that the plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, recover of the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, the sum of \$847.77, together with interest thereon at the rate of six per cent from the first day of September, 1919, and his costs herein expended, including a fee of \$250.00 hereby allowed to the said referee, and in all taxed at \$—, to which order and decree the said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, by its counsel, excepts.

11 The said defendant having given notice of its intention to appeal said cause to the Court of Appeals, Franklin County, Ohio, it is by the court ordered that the amount of such appeal bond be \$500, with surety to the approval of the court of this county.

[Duly certified.]

*Petition.*

[Filed November 13, 1916.]

The plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, says:

That on the first day of May, 1886, The Hartford Accident Insurance Company was duly incorporated a corporation under the act of the general assembly of the state of Connecticut, and accepted and adopted the terms, powers and limitations of a charter as defined in said act of the general assembly of the state of Connecticut and duly organized thereunder as such corporation with the powers and limitations therein enumerated and contained.

That thereafter by amendment to its charter, said Hartford Accident Insurance Company, being authorized so to do by act of the general assembly of the state of Connecticut, dated May 22, 1867, duly changed its name to The Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company, and subject to the powers and limitations as contained in said act, amended its said charter.

That thereafter, by amendment to its said charter, said The Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company, being authorized so to do by the act of the general assembly of the state of Connecticut,

12 dated July 17, 1868, duly changed its name to The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, and subject to the powers and limitations as contained in said act, amended its said charter.

That thereafter, by amendment to its said charter, said The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, being authorized so to do by act of the general assembly of the state of Connecticut, dated the third day of March, 1897, duly changed its name to The Hartford Life Insurance Company, subject to the powers and limitations contained in said act, amended its said charter, and which said last described act of the general assembly of the state of Connecticut duly provided as follows:

"Section I. That the corporate name of The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, a corporation located and doing a life insurance business in Hartford, in the state of Connecticut, be and the same is hereby changed to The Hartford Life Insurance Company, by which name it shall be hereafter known and called.

"Section II. All contracts, rights, obligations, property, privileges and franchises of the said The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company shall be and remain unimpaired and vested in the corporation under its new name."

That the said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, is engaged in carrying on its said business within the state of Ohio, and was so engaged at the several times hereinafter set forth.

That its cause of action against the said defendant, the plaintiff Robert H. Langdale, says:

13 That on the fourth day of May, 1882, in consideration of the representations, agreements and warranties, made an application for the insurance hereinafter described, and of an admission fee paid, and of the sum of ten dollars to be paid the said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, and by The Hartford Life Insurance Company depositing with a certain trustee to create a Safety Fund as herein described, and of three dollars per annum for expense and the further payment in accordance with the conditions of a certain certificate of insurance, then issued and delivered to the said plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, insured the life of the said Robert H. Langdale, in the sum of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00). That said certificate of insurance provided that said amount of three thousand dollars, upon the death of said Robert H. Langdale, the plaintiff herein, should be paid to Harriet Langdale, his wife, within ninety days after the receipt of proof of death of the said Robert H. Langdale.

A copy of said certificate of insurance, being of the same tenor and effect, is attached hereto and marked Exhibit "A."

Plaintiff further says that he duly kept and performed all the terms and conditions of said contract of insurance, as represented by said certificate of insurance, from the date of the issue of said certificate of insurance until February 26, 1914, at which time, by reason of the excessive assessments charged against him, the said plaintiff

tiff, for the alleged maintenance in force of said insurance, he was at said time compelled to yield up and cease to carry and maintain said certificate of insurance in said defendant company, and that at the time of the payment of the last assessment thereon, February 14 26, 1914, said defendant company then had of the moneys of said plaintiff, which it had collected in manner and form as hereinafter set forth, and which it held in trust for the said plaintiff, the sum of about eight hundred fifty dollars (\$850.00). That said plaintiff reached the age of 60 years on August 4, 1901. Thereafter, in violation of the terms of said certificate, he was compelled to pay assessments, until he ceased paying same, at the rate of four dollars per assessment on each one thousand of insurance in force.

That said plaintiff, by reason of the excessive assessments so levied against him upon said certificates of insurance, was compelled to and did cease paying upon said certificates of insurance, at said rate, at the age of 74 years, to wit: on the 25th day of February, 1914.

That each and all of said payments so made by him in advance of two dollars and sixty-eight cents per payment on each thousand dollars of said insurance, so issued by the said defendant company, is held by the said defendant company in trust for this said plaintiff pursuant to the terms of said certificate and each and every part thereof. Plaintiff says that each and all of said payments made by him after he arrived at the age of 60 years was made and paid in ignorance of his legal rights and under mistake of law, and that said amount of excessive payments, of which amount plaintiff is not advised but is about eight hundred and fifty dollars, is held in trust by said defendant company for this plaintiff.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays that an account may be taken of the amounts so paid to the defendant and held by the defendant in trust for this plaintiff, and that upon the determination of such amount that the same may be by decree of this court decreed to the plaintiff, and for such other and further relief in favor of said plaintiff and against said defendant as the justice and equity of the case may require.

SMITH W. BENNETT,  
HUGH M. BENNETT,  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff.*

[Duly verified.]

*Precipe for Summons.*

To the Clerk of said Court:

Issue summons herein to the sheriff of Franklin County, Ohio, for the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company; direct the service of the same to be made upon the defendant company pursuant to the provisions of section- 9381 and 9382 of the General Code of Ohio. Such service to be made upon John Blankpied, Grant Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, the agent last designated and acting for the defendant company in county of Franklin, state of Ohio. Also direct the said sheriff to send a copy of the summons, with all endorse-

ments thereon, by mail to the address of the defendant company at the city of Hartford, in the state of Connecticut, that being its principal or home office, and have him make his return accordingly. Endorse the same "Accounting and equitable relief demanded."

Columbus, O., Nov. 13, 1916.

SMITH W. BENNETT,  
*Attorney for Plaintiff.*

16

"EXHIBIT A."

*Certificate of Membership.*

Benefit Not to Exceed \$3,000.

No. 30031.

Safety Fund Department.

Age 40.

The

Hartford Life and Annuity Ins. Co.  
of Hartford, Connecticut,

In consideration of the representations, agreements and warranties made in the application herofor, and of the Admission Fee paid; and of the sum of Ten Dollars, to be paid to said Company, on each \$1,000 of the maximum indemnity herein provided for to create a Safety Fund, as hereinafter described, and of Three Dollars per annum on each \$1,000, for expenses, to be paid as hereinafter conditioned and of the further payment, in accordance with the conditions hereof, of all Mortuary Assessments, does hereby issue this Certificate of Membership in its Safety Fund Department to Robert H. Langdale of Terrace Park, county of Hamilton, state of Ohio, with the following agreements:

That said Company will deposit said sum of Ten Dollars, when received, with the Trustee, named in a contract made with it (of which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust for the uses and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall at the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety Fund shall then amount to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or whenever thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-annual division of the net interest received therefrom by it, pro rata among all the holders of Certificates in force in said Department at such times,

who shall have contributed, five years prior to the date of  
17 any such division their stipulated proportion of said Fund, by applying the same to the payment of their future dues and assessments; and that, whenever said Fund shall amount to One Million Dollars all subsequent receipts therefor shall be divided by the said Company in like manner as the interest. Said Company further agrees that if at any time, after said Fund shall have amounted to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or after five years from January 1, 1880, if that amount shall not have been attained before that date, it shall fail by reason of insufficient membership.



or, shall neglect if justly and legally due, to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any Certificate issued in said Department and such Certificate shall be presented for payment to said Trustee by the legal holder thereof, accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as hereinafter provided, of its failure to pay, after demand upon it within the time herein stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be the duty of said Trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and divide the same (less the reasonable charges and expenses for the management and control of said Fund) among all the holders of Certificates then in force in said Department, or their legal representatives, in the proportion which the amount of each of their Certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole number of such Certificates in force; and that in such event it shall file with said Trustee a correct list under oath, of the names, residences and amounts of the Certificates of all members entitled to participate in such division. The evidence referred to above to be either certification by said In-

18 surance Company's President or Secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for the period of sixty days from this date. And said Company further agrees that so long as any Certificate of Membership in the Safety Fund Department shall remain in force, said Fund shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose except as above mentioned.

Upon the death of the member aforesaid while this Certificate is in force, all the conditions hereof having been conformed to by said member, and on the receipt by the President or Secretary of said Company of satisfactory proofs of such death, an assessment shall be made upon the holders of all Certificates in force in said Department at the date of such death, according to the table of graduated assessment rates, given hereon, as determined by their respective ages and the number of such Certificates in force at the date of such death, and the sum collected thereon (less ten cents per each member assessed for cost of collection) shall be paid—provided, however, that in no case shall the payment upon this Certificate in the event of such death exceed One Thousand Dollars (less Fifteen Dollars as a post mortem contribution to said Safety Fund, if the deceased member shall not have fully contributed therefor as hereinbefore required, together with any balance due said Company) to

19 his legal representatives within ninety days after the receipt of such proofs, upon presentation and surrender of this Certificate. All such payments to be made at the Home Office of said Company in lawful money of the United States.

And said Company further agrees that such Mortuary Assessment shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose other than for the payment of Death Claims, except as above mentioned.

This Certificate is Issued by the Company and Accepted by the Member Upon the Following Express Conditions and Agreements:

1. Application Made Part of Contract.—The application on the faith of which this Certificate issues is hereby referred to and made part of this contract.

2. Of Payments.—The person to whom this Certificate is issued agrees to pay to said Company Three Dollars per annum for expenses on the first day of the month after date of issue, and at every anniversary thereafter, so long as this Certificate shall remain in force; or by monthly or other pro rata installments of the same in advance for periods of less than a year. And also agrees to pay said Company, upon each Certificate that shall become a claim, an assessment in accordance with the Table of Graduated Assessment Rates, as printed hereon, within thirty days from day on which notice bears date. And further agrees to pay said Company the sum of Ten Dollars towards Safety Fund, within sixty days from the date of this Certificate, which will entitle the holder hereof to all the advantages under said fund, as set forth in the agreement

20 with the Trustees aforesaid, a copy of which is printed hereon and hereby made a part of this contract; all such payments to be made direct to said Company. But with the written permission of said Company attached hereto, said payment required to be made towards the Safety Fund, or any part thereof, may be postponed and made payable at such other times as shall be named in such permission: And, while the whole or any portion of such payment shall remain unpaid, said Company may apply any sum standing to the credit of this Certificate towards such payment.

3. Conditions of Acceptance.—The holder of this Certificate further agrees and accepts the same upon the express condition that if either the monthly dues, assessments or the payment of the Ten Dollars towards the Safety Fund, as hereinbefore required, are not paid to said Company on the day due, then this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages or the recovery of any moneys paid for protection while the Certification was in force, either from said Company or the Trustees of the Safety Fund; and that if a legal and just claim to benefit, under the terms of this Certificate, shall arise before said Safety Fund shall have accumulated to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or before January 1, 1885, and the sum collected on the assessment to be made in such event shall be paid over, as hereinbefore stipulated; or such claim shall arise after said Fund shall have accumulated to said amount or after January 1, 1885, and this Certificate shall be fully settled and surrendered; or if any final division from said Safety Fund, as hereinbefore provided, shall be made by the

21 Trustee thereof on account of this Certificate, then, in such cases, all liability of said Company and of its Safety Fund on account of this Certificate, shall cease.

4. Mode of Giving Notice.—A printed or written notice, directed to the address of the member, as it appears at the time on the books of the Company, and deposited in the post office at Hartford, or delivered by an agent of the Company, shall be deemed a legal

and sufficient notice for all purposes hereof. A transcript of the books of said Company, certified by the Secretary, showing such facts, shall be taken and accepted as conclusive evidence of the mailing of such notice, and of the facts aforesaid, as set forth in such transcript.

5. Change of Residence or Address.—In case of change of residence, post office address, occupation, or name of the member, or his or her legal representatives, it is agreed on the part of the member that notice thereof in writing shall at once be given to the Secretary of the Company. In case of failure to do so, the Company may proceed for all purposes as if no such change had been made.

6. Prohibitions.—If the member named in this Certificate shall be personally engaged in blasting, submarine operations, mining under ground, manufacturing poisonous or explosive chemicals, "breaking" or "coupling" on, and "making-up" of, railroad trains, trading or living among savage tribes or nations, or shall be engaged in military or naval service (except in time of peace) without, in each of these cases, having first obtained the written consent of said Company, or shall use alcoholic or narcotic stimulants so as to produce intoxication sufficient to impair his or her health, or to produce delirium tremens, or to cause his or her death, or shall die by self-destruction—feloniously or otherwise—or while intoxicated, or from effects of drunkenness, or in consequence of a duel, or of keeping or visiting unlawful or disreputable resorts, or the violation or attempted violation of the laws of any Nation, State, Province or Municipality, or if there has been any concealment, misrepresentation, or false statement or statement not true made in the application on which this Certificate issues; or if the conditions herein shall not be in all respects observed and performed by the party to whom this Certificate issues; then, and in all such cases, this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages, or the recovery of any moneys paid thereon.

7. Travel and Residence.—The member herein named is at liberty to travel by railroad, sea, lake, or river, by all trains, first-class steamers, or sailing vessels, and to visit or reside in any portion of the world other than the residence named in the application herefor, where inhabited and civilized, and free from epidemics, wars, or internal dissensions.

8. Limitation of Action.—It is expressly understood and agreed that no action shall be maintained, nor recovery had, for any claim upon or by virtue of this Certificate, after the lapse of one year from the death of said member; and if no suit or proceedings for such recovery be commenced within one year from the date of death of said member it shall be deemed a waiver, on the part of all parties concerned, of all rights or claims under or by virtue of this Certificate, and as conclusive evidence against the validity of such claim, and this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages or the recovery of

any moneys paid thereon. And it is further expressly agreed, in case any suit or proceeding shall be commenced for the recovery of any claim under this Certificate after the lapse of one year from the death of said member, or when the claim is otherwise illegal or fraudulent, that the person or persons so commencing suit or proceeding, on failure to obtain judgment therefor, shall pay to said Company the sum of two hundred dollars, as its reasonable attorney fees and damages, which sum shall be taxed as costs in the case, and shall be collected as other costs in the suit are collected.

9. Debts and Liens.—It is further agreed that this Certificate shall be charged with any and all amounts that may be owing from the member or beneficiary herein, or their assigns, to said Company at the time of the payment of this Certificate, and the Company reserves a lien thereon to secure the payment of any such indebtedness, and the right to deduct and withhold the amount of any such account or indebtedness in payment thereof. And that in case any County, State, or Municipality in which the member of his legal representative may reside shall levy a tax to be paid by said Company on account of any moneys collected hereon, said member agrees to pay the amount of such tax to said Company in addition to the payments hereinbefore named, as part of the payments needed to hold this Certificate in force, upon notice and demand by said Company, either in connection with the payments of assessments and annual dues or otherwise, as said Company may from time to time elect.

10. Assignments.—This Certificate shall not be assigned or transferred, unless notice and copy of this assignment be given to said Company, nor, unless a claim hereunder, made by an assignee, be subject to proof of interest.

11. Powers of Agents.—Agents of the Company can not alter or waive any of the conditions of this Certificate, nor issue permits of any kind, and they are not authorized to make any indorsements hereon, nor to receive money or assessments, dues, or Safety Fund deposits maturing and payable after the issue of this Certificate.

In Witness whereof, the said Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company have, by their President and Secretary, signed and delivered this contract, at Hartford, Conn., this 4th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two.

(Signed)

[SEAL.]

T. R. FOSTER,  
*President.*

(Signed) W. A. COWLES,  
*Ass. Secretary.*

(Agents of the Company are not authorized to make any indorsements on this certificate.)

*Trustee's Contract.*

This agreement, made and entered into this thirty-first day of December, A. D. 1879, by and between the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Connecticut, and located in the City of Hartford in said State, party of the first part; and the Security Company, a like corporation also located at said Hartford, party of the second part; witnesseth:

Whereas, The party of the first part purposes to issue to persons contracting therefor, Certificates of membership in a special department of its business to be known as the Safety Fund Department, and, in consideration of the sum of ten dollars to be received on each one thousand dollars of the amount of each and every such Certificate for the purpose of creating a Safety Fund, to insert therein sundry agreements with such persons in the following words; to-wit:

"That said Company will deposit said sum of ten dollars, when" received, with the Trustee, named in a contract made with it (of" which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust for" the uses and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall at" the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety Fund" shall then amount to three hundred thousand dollars, or whenever" thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-annual dis-" tribution of the net interest received therefrom by it, pro rata" among all the holders of Certificates in force in said department at" such times, who shall have contributed five years prior to" the date of any such division their stipulated proportion" of said Fund, by applying the same to the payment of" their future dues and assessments; and that, whenever said Fund" shall amount to one million dollars all subsequent receipts there-" for shall be distributed by the said Company in like manner as" the interest."

"Said Company further agrees that if at any time, after said" Fund shall have amounted to three hundred thousand dollars, or" after five years from January 1, 1880, if that amount shall not" have been attained before that date, it shall fail by reason of in-" sufficient membership, or, shall neglect if and legally due, to pay" the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any Cer-" tificates issued in said department, and such Certificate shall be" presented for payment to said Trustee by the legal holder thereof," accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as hereinafter provided, of" its failure to pay, after demand upon it within the time herein" stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be the duty of said" Trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and dis-" tribute the same (less the reasonable charges and expenses for the" management and control of said Fund) among all the holders of" Certificates then in force in said department, or their legal repre-" sentatives, in the proportion which the amount of each of their" Certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole number of such"

"Certificates in force; and that in such event it shall file with said Trustee a correct list, under oath, of the names, residences and amounts of the Certificates of all members entitled to participate in such division. The evidence referred to above to be either certification by said Insurance Company's President or Secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for a period of sixty days from this date."

"And said Company further agrees that so long as any Certificate of membership in its Safety Fund Department shall remain in force, said Fund shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose except as above mentioned."

Now, Therefore, the party of the first part, in consideration of the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained on the part of the party of the second part and in accordance with its agreement with its Certificate holders, as hereinbefore recited, does hereby appoint the party of the second part Trustee as aforesaid and covenants and agrees with it and its successors in said trust to deposit with said Trustee, as soon as received, the sum of ten dollars on each thousand dollars of the amount of each and every Certificate of membership issued by it in the aforesaid department until said Fund shall amount to one million dollars, to be by said Trustee held in trust and accumulated as hereinafter agreed, and the income thereof, less the reasonable compensation and expense of said trust, to be paid over to the party of the first part, as hereinafter provided, to be used by the party of the first part in accordance with the hereinbefore recited agreements: And when said Trustee shall pay the income, as above, to the party of the first part, or, shall make any other payments from said Fund, as required by the terms hereof, the liability of said Trustee on the amount so paid shall cease; it being understood and agreed that said Fund belongs to the party of the first part, subject to the expressed trusts herein provided.

And the party of the second part, for itself and its successors, in consideration of such deposits and of a reasonable compensation for its services, and the necessary expenses of managing said trust, covenants and agrees with the party of the first part and its successors and with each of the holders of the aforesaid Certificates that it will receive, hold, manage and dispose of all said deposits made with it by said Insurance Company, principal and income, in accordance with the uses and purposes specified in the hereinbefore recited agreements of the party of the first part with its Certificate holders; and shall at all reasonable times exhibit to the party of the first part the securities and investments composing said Trust Fund; and shall render true statements of the account of said funds and the income thereof to any person entitled to request the same by reason of an interest therein; said party of the first part hereby agreeing to keep the party of the second part correctly informed of the names, at

addresses, numbers and amounts of Certificates of all persons thus entitled.

That, as often as the sum composing such Fund shall be in amount sufficient to purchase one thousand dollars, par value, of United States

29 Bonds, said Trustee shall make investments of such funds therein and register the same in its name as Trustee of the

Safety Fund of the said Insurance Company, and, provided no default by the party of the first part as hereinbefore recited shall

occur, shall accumulate said Fund and the income thereof (less the reasonable compensation and expenses), for five years from July 1,

1879, or until such time thereafter as such Fund shall amount to three hundred thousand dollars, par value, of the securities pur-

chased for said Fund, when the party of the second part will pay over to the party of the first part, semi-annually thereafter, all the

further income from said Fund (less the accruing and unpaid compensation and expenses), to be by the party of the first part used for

the purposes mentioned in the hereinbefore recited agreements: And, unless such default shall occur, will thereafter add to the principal

of said Fund the deposits thereafter received from the party of the first part, exclusive of the income therefrom, until the whole

Fund shall amount in such securities at their par value, to one million dollars: And in the event of the failure or neglect mentioned

in the hereinbefore recited agreements, will convert said Fund into money and distribute the same in accordance with the hereinbefore

recited agreements, as soon as can reasonably be done after the necessary information of the proper persons and their shares shall

have been obtained: Said party of the first part hereby agreeing to put the party of the second part in possession of the information re-

quired for the making of a proper distribution thereof as agreed with its Certificate holders.

30 All payments required hereby to be made to the party of the first part to cease upon the aforesaid failure or neglect

of the party of the first part; and all payments required herein to be made to the Certificate holders by the party of the second part to be

made at the office of said Trustee or of the successor in said trust. The necessary expenses connected with the management of said

Fund shall be limited to the ordinary commissions for purchasing or selling and transfer or transmission of the hereinbefore men-

tioned securities, together with the cost of the stationery and postage used in replying to requests for information of the condition of said

Fund and the actual cost of any judicial action needed to determine the legal status of said Fund: All other expenses to be included in

and covered by such reasonable charge as shall be made for the compensation of the trusteeship, to be determined by the amount

of time and labor involved in the execution thereof. It is hereby mutually understood and agreed by both parties

hereto that all the hereinbefore recited agreements of the party of the first part with the Certificate holders shall constitute the uses

and purposes of the trust expressed herein. And it is hereby further understood and agreed that at such time as it shall be shown that

all Certificates of membership issued by the party of the first part in



its Safety Fund Department, have been legally settled and surrendered to it, or properly canceled in accordance with their terms, it shall be held and considered that the uses and purpose of said trust have been fully accomplished by said Insurance Company, and the balance of said Fund, if any, shall be paid over to the party of the first part.

And it is further understood and agreed that if said party of the second part shall, for any cause, fail to perform its duties as such Trustee as hereinbefore specified, or if, by reason of financial embarrassment of the party of the second part, or other cause, it shall be deemed expedient to remove said trust from its hands, then a new Trustee may be appointed, by the mutual nomination of said Insurance Company, and the then Insurance Commissioner of the State of Connecticut, to succeed to said trust, with all the duties and obligations herein imposed upon said original Trustee, and said party of the second part shall surrender said Fund to such successor.

In witness whereof, the party of the first part has affixed hereunto the corporate seal of said Insurance Company and caused these presents to be signed by its President and Secretary.

And the party of the second part has hereto affixed its corporate seal and its President and Treasurer have hereunto set their hands.

Done in duplicate at Hartford in the State of Connecticut the day and year first above written.

[SEAL.]

HARTFORD LIFE AND ANNUITY  
INS. CO.,  
By E. H. CROSBY,  
*President, and*  
STEPHEN BALL,  
*Secretary.*

[SEAL.]

SECURITY COMPANY,  
By ROBERT E. DAY, *President, and*  
WILLIAM L. MATSON, *Treasurer.*

32 *Table of Graduated Assessment Rates for Death Losses for Every \$1,000 of a Total Indemnity of \$1,000,000.*

	Age.	Rate.	Age.	Rate.	Age.	Rate.
15 to	21....	\$0.65	35....	\$0.97	48....	\$1.33
	22....	.67	36....	1.00	49....	1.40
	23....	.69	37....	1.03	50....	1.45
	24....	.71	38....	1.06	51....	1.50
	25....	.73	39....	1.09	52....	1.55
	26....	.75	40....	1.12	53....	1.60
	27....	.77	41....	1.14	54....	1.65
	28....	.79	42....	1.16	55....	1.70
	29....	.81	43....	1.18	56....	1.75
	30....	.83	44....	1.20	57....	1.80
	31....	.85	45....	1.22	58....	1.85
	32....	.88	46....	1.25	59....	1.90
	33....	.91	47....	1.30	60....	1.95
	34....	.94				



These rates decrease in proportion as the total indemnity in force increases above one millian dollars in amount, and are calculated so as to cover the usual expense for collecting.

Received of The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, of Hartford, Conn., — in full for all claims under this Certificate, No. —, on the life of — — —, deceased.

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Beneficiary.

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Beneficiary.

Witness:  
\_\_\_\_\_.

(Back of Policy.)

This Company has no agents authorized to receive money on Assessments, Dues, or Safety Fund.

33

No. 34501.

Safety Fund Department.

*Certificate of Membership.*

Benefit Not to Exceed \$3,000.

Issued by The

Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Co.,

Hartford, Conn.

Name, Robert H. Langdale.

Agent, B. F. Coon.

Read carefully all the conditions of this certificate.

No person should be a party to a contract without knowing all its conditions.

After an Agent has delivered this Certificate, and collected the Admission Fee, no other payment connected with the indemnity under this Certificate must be made to the agent without the production of a receipt signed by the Company's Secretary.

Always give number of this certificate in writing to home office.

Know all men by these Presents, That the undersigned beneficiary— named in the within Certificate, issued to — — — in consideration of — have sold, assigned and conveyed to — — — of — — — County of — — —, State of — — —, and to h— heirs and assigns forever, all — right, title, and interest in the within Certificate of Membership, subject to the terms and conditions thereof.

I hereby constitute the said assignee or assignees its attorney, in my name, but to h— own use, to take all legal measures  
 34 which may be proper to keep in force said Certificate and finally collect all amounts due and to become due thereunder with power of substitution.

Witness my hand and seal this — day of —, 18—.

— — —. [SEAL.]

If more than one beneficiary, they can sign below.

*Answer.*

[Filed December 13, 1918.]

Defendant has at all times herein protested against and objected to the jurisdiction of this court over it and the subject matter of this cause, and, having appeared solely for the purpose and without waiving the jurisdiction or entering an appearance herein, filed a demurrer and an amended demurrer to the jurisdiction of this court on the grounds set forth in said demurrers, and said demurrers having been overruled over its objection and exception, and the court having ordered the defendant to plead herein, defendant, renewing its protest against and objection to the jurisdiction of the court over it and the subject matter of this action herein, files this its answer to the petition, being forced thereto by the overruling of such protest and objection and by the order of the court herein, which is by this defendant claimed to be erroneous and in violation of its rights under the law of the land and of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and of the amendments thereto.

Defendant is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Connecticut; its officers reside in and  
 35 conduct the business of said company in the state of Connecticut; its office, books, papers and records are all in the state of Connecticut; that it has no offices in the state of Ohio; that the remedy of an accounting and money judgment sought in this proceeding is outside and beyond the jurisdiction of this court; that this court is without the power to enforce the remedy sought by the plaintiff in this proceeding, and that such remedy is wholly and entirely within the jurisdiction of the court of Connecticut, to which application should be made for the relief herein prayed for, all for the reasons herein fully set forth.

Defendant says that in and by the petition herein plaintiff charges and avers that the defendant has assessed the plaintiff in a sum in excess of that provided by the terms of the contract or certificate of membership or policy of insurance referred to in said petition, in this: that the assessment rate provided for by said certificate of policy of insurance, on and after the plaintiff reached the age of sixty (60) years, was two dollars and sixty-eight (\$2.68) per assessment for each one thousand dollars (\$1,000) of insurance; that defendant has assessed plaintiff in excess of said rate of two dollars and sixty-eight cents (\$2.68) per assessment for each one thousand

lars (\$1,000) of insurance, after he reached the age of sixty (60) years; that the amount of the excessive assessments paid by the plaintiff after he reached the age of sixty (60) years is to him unknown, but that the same with interest, is about eight hundred and fifty dollars (\$850.00), and plaintiff prays the court that an accounting be taken and ordered so as to ascertain the amount of such excess in each of the said several assessments levied by the defendant against the plaintiff since the fourth day of August, 1901, when the plaintiff reached the age of sixty (60) years.

Defendant further says that at the time the alleged policy of insurance or certificate of membership was entered into between the parties hereto, the defendant was conducting and operating a department of life insurance upon the mutual or assessment plan, known as the Safety Fund Department, in which said department and under which plan of insurance the certificate or policy of insurance sued on herein was issued, and that the corporate name of the defendant at the time said certificate or policy of insurance was issued was The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company; that subsequently defendant changed its name to Hartford Life Insurance Company, and at all times herein stated has continued to operate and conduct its Safety Fund Department, in which it does the business of life insurance, upon the assessment or mutual plan, as aforesaid, of which department plaintiff was a member and held said certificate or policy sued on herein.

Defendant further says that the assessments referred to in plaintiff's petition were levied quarterly, and since the fourth day of August, 1901, more than fifty (50) assessments have been levied against the plaintiff on said certificate or policy of insurance, and that the inquiry and accounting sought to be had by the petition involves, therefore, an inquiry into each of the said several assessments so levied on said certificate or policy of insurance.

Defendant further says that, by the terms of said policy or certificate sued on herein, it is expressly provided that "the rates decrease in proportion as the total indemnity in force increases above one million dollars;" which is to say, the assessment rate provided for in said certificate is the rate of assessment at each thousand dollars (\$1,000), upon the basis of one million dollars (\$1,000,000) of outstanding insurance or indemnity in force at the time of the levy of each of said assessments, and that if the total indemnity or insurance in force at the time of the levy of such assessment exceeds the sum of one million dollars (\$1,000,000), the rate of assessment is to be proportionately decreased, and that where there is more than one death loss of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to be assessed for at the time of the levy of such assessment, the rate and the amount of such assessment or assessments is accordingly increased by the number, per one thousand dollars (\$1,000) of such death losses, and that it is so provided by said certificate or policy of insurance.

Defendant further says that at the time of each of the assessments complained of in the petition herein, the indemnity or insurance in

force was largely in excess of one million dollars (\$1,000,000) and varied in amount at the time of each assessment; that at each assessment there was in excess of one death loss of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to be assessed for; that the number of deaths so to  
38 be assessed for at the time of such assessments varied and at times such death losses exceeded the sum of sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000); so an inquiry as to the proper rate of assessment on said policy or certificate of insurance involved and required the ascertainment of the total amount of insurance or indemnity in force at the time each assessment was levied, as well as the number of deaths for which each assessment was levied.

Defendant further says that in the petition herein the plaintiff asks and prays that the court shall require defendant to account to plaintiff for that proportion or amount of the assessments paid by the plaintiff under said certificate which are averred to be in excess of the rate of "\$2.68 per assessment per thousand dollars of insurance in force under said certificate of insurance," regardless of the amount of indemnity in force or the number of deaths at the time when said assessments were levied, and to recover judgment against defendant for the difference between the assessments actually levied and the amount of assessments so to be ascertained.

Defendant further says that the remedy of accounting and of a money judgment based upon such accounting as is prayed for by the plaintiff would require a complete and exhaustive visitation of the affairs of the defendant at its home office in Hartford, Connecticut, and an examination of all of the books and records for many years past, that is to say, from 1901 to 1914, and would amount to an interference with the internal management of the defendant, a foreign corporation, contrary to and in excess of the powers of this  
39 court under such circumstances; that such inquiry and accounting would involve a computation of a long, intricate and involved account based upon data which exists in and can only be ascertained from the books and records of the defendant, located in the state of Connecticut; and can only be properly taken by a commissioner appointed by the courts of a state having full jurisdiction of the defendant and of its officers; and, while this court may have jurisdiction to decree an accounting under some conditions, it is beyond the jurisdiction and power of this court to decree such an accounting against defendant, a non-resident corporation; that such remedy, if it exists and is enforced on behalf of plaintiff in this state, exists with respect to every other member holding similar certificates or policies of the Safety Fund Department of the defendant, and the defendant says that it has many thousands of members and certificate holders in the Safety Fund Department located throughout the different states of the United States, each of whom holds a certificate similar to that held by plaintiff; that said members aggregate some fifty thousand (50,000) in number; that the ascertainment of the excess, if any, charged against the plaintiff on each of said several assessments involves, likewise, the ascertainment of the alleged excess charged against each and every other member of the Safety Fund Department of the defendant, as all of

said members of said Safety Fund Department were assessed on the same basis, plan and table of rates as the plaintiff herein; that no intelligent or just judgment as to the amount of the claimed excess could be ascertained without entering into an elaborate accounting, involving the ascertainment of the proper assessment to be made against each and every other member of the Safety Fund Department of the defendant, and that if the remedy sought by the plaintiff were granted, similar or like remedies might be demanded by each of said several members in each of the several states of the United States, which would amount, in effect, to an extermination of the business of the defendant.

Defendant says that if this court proceeds with this cause and entertains jurisdiction hereof and grants the relief prayed for by plaintiff, it will greatly embarrass and obstruct defendant in the prosecution of its business, so that any appeal from any judgment or decree in this cause granting such relief would be wholly inadequate to preserve and protect the rights of defendant and members of the Safety Fund Department; and that if this court shall proceed and determine the issues made by the petition and shall thereby undertake to review the propriety of past acts of the defendant touching the levy of assessments under said certificate and shall attempt, by the decree of this court to fix and adjudge what this court shall conceive to be the proper amount to be charged by defendant against the plaintiff as assessments under said certificate, that defendant would be greatly embarrassed and obstructed in the discharge of its obligations to the members of the Safety Fund Department, and in the orderly prosecution of its business, and all this without jurisdiction or power to make, grant or enforce said remedy.

Defendant says that the courts of Connecticut, in which defendant is domiciled, have the sole and exclusive jurisdiction and power to entertain a suit having for its object and purpose the determination of what constitutes a valid and proper assessment under certificates issued by the Safety Fund Department of the defendant and the granting of the relief prayed for by the plaintiff herein; that if the courts of Connecticut should by their decrees and judgments, determine that the proper amount of the assessments which should be levied by the defendant against the members of its Safety Fund Department is different from the amount of the assessments which this court may, by its decree or judgment, decide to be the correct or proper amount, then defendant will be subject to conflicting decrees of different courts on the same subject matter, thereby giving rise to unseemly conflict between the courts of this state and the courts of Connecticut; that any change which this court should decree to be made in the manner or method or the amount of defendant's assessments levied on the certificate in suit, would disturb and disarrange, pending any appeal from this court, the relations, obligations, and duties between the defendant and the whole body of its members of the Safety Fund Department; that no decree could or can be entered by this court which would not amount to a most complete attempt to regulate defendant's internal affairs and to review the propriety of defendant's dealings in the past and

future with the members of its Safety Fund Department; that defendant has no officers within the State of Ohio upon whom any writ or similar orders which might be issued by this court could or can

be served; that defendant has no property in the State of  
42 Ohio; that unless this court desists from making further orders and decrees in this cause and from entertaining jurisdiction herein, defendant will be required to either suffer a judgment by default to be taken against it in this cause or offer evidence herein and at great expense support this answer by proofs upon the hearing of this cause and to go to trial on the merits thereof, and thereby defendant and its transactions and internal affairs would be subject to the visitation, regulation, and control of this court; and that, in order to meet by proof the issues so raised by the petition, it would be necessary to examine all of the accounts between defendant and all of its members of the Safety Fund Department, of whom there are a great number throughout the states of the United States, from the time plaintiff alleges he has been excessively charged or assessed, to wit, from the fourth day of August, 1901, up to the present time. Defendant says that in order for it to comply with such an order or decree of accounting it would become necessary for defendant to bring before this court its books, papers and records touching the matter in controversy, at a great disturbance and destruction of the orderly and proper transaction of its business; that in order to make the showing demanded of the defendant by the plaintiff in said petition it will be necessary for defendant to take its officers and employes away from their usual and ordinary duties in the home office of defendant in the state of Connecticut and to require them to devote much of their time for weeks to the proper presentation and preparation of its defense herein; that it will be

43 come necessary for the officers and employes of the defendant, in order to make a proper defense herein, to leave their duties at the home office of the company, travel to the State of Ohio, and remain in attendance upon said court for an indefinite time, at the great hardship and oppression of the defendant.

Defendant further says that the remedy of an accounting sought by the plaintiff, is, in substance and effect, an effort to have the court regulate and control the conduct of the internal affairs of defendant at its domicile in the state of Connecticut, and is, therefore, beyond the jurisdiction of this court; that the granting of said relief by this court would be without due process of law, and would deprive defendant of its property without due process of law, contrary to and in violation of Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; that a decree or judgment entered in said cause adjudging the return to the plaintiff of portions of assessments previously made by defendant upon plaintiff as a member and certificate holder in the Safety Fund Department, as prayed in the petition, would likewise be a regulation of the conduct and internal affairs of the defendant at its domicile in the state of Connecticut, and the granting of said relief would deprive defendant of its property without due process of law, contrary to and in vio

lation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Defendant further alleges that all of the assessments complained of by the plaintiff herein were levied for the purpose of paying the death losses insured by the deaths of members holding similar certificates in said department of the defendant company, and the proceeds of said assessments have been applied in the payment of death losses.

Still protesting against and objecting to the jurisdiction of the court in this cause, and answering herein because of the orders of the court herein, which defendant alleges are erroneous and in violation of defendant's rights as aforesaid, defendant admits that it is a corporation duly created and existing under the laws of the state of Connecticut, formerly under the name of the Hartford Accident Insurance Company; that thereafter its name was duly changed to The Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company, and thereafter its name was again changed to the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, and its name was thereafter again changed to the Hartford Life Insurance Company; that it was formerly licensed to do and engage in carrying on its business in the State of Ohio; that on or about the fourth day of May, 1882, for the consideration stated therein, it issued and delivered to the plaintiff one (1) certain benefit certificates in its Safety Fund Department in the sum of three thousand dollars (\$3,000), payable upon the death of the plaintiff, as provided in said certificate, a copy of which said certificate is attached to the petition and marked "Exhibit A;" that upon the back of said certificate were printed certain tables of graduated assessment rates; that the plaintiff paid the assessments made and levied against him by defendant under said certificate, but defendant denies that the assessments made and levied against the plaintiff under such certificate were not in accordance and in compliance with the terms of said certificate, and denies that plaintiff was assessed in excess of the amount that was leviable by the said certificate or by the rates provided for in and on such certificate.

Defendant denies each and every fact, statement and allegation in the petition not herein admitted.

Defendant further alleges that the assessments so paid and complained of by the plaintiff herein under said certificate were voluntary payments on the part of the plaintiff.

Defendant further says that plaintiff had, during the period from the fourth day of August, 1901, up to and until the time when the certificate held by the plaintiff lapsed and became void by reason of his failure to pay the assessments properly made thereunder, and up to the filing of this action, knowledge and the means of knowledge of his rights, duties and obligations under said certificate of membership, and, with knowledge and the means of knowledge, of all the facts, voluntarily and without coercion, improper influence, or protest, paid each of the several assessments made and levied by defendant upon the certificates so held by plaintiff, in the aggregate number of approximately fifty (which amounts so collected being disbursed to the beneficiaries under other certificates matured by

death), and is now estopped to deny the validity or propriety of said assessments; that the larger portion of the alleged cause of action set forth in the petition did not accrue within six years next before the commencement of this action, and is therefore barred by the statute of limitations in such cases made and provided.

Wherefore, defendant prays that its protest and objection heretofore and now made herein against and to the jurisdiction of this court over it and the subject matter of this action herein shall be sustained; that its rights under the laws and Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto shall be maintained and protected and that this court shall hold it is without jurisdiction over the defendant and the subject matter of this action.

JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT AND  
ARNOLD & GAME,

*Attorneys for Defendant.*

[Duly verified.]

*Reply of Plaintiff.*

[Filed January 10, 1919.]

Now comes the plaintiff and for his first reply to the answer of the defendant or in so far as he is informed it is necessary to reply thereto, says:

1. He admits defendant is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of Connecticut.

2. He admits that in his petition he charges and avers that said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, has assessed said plaintiff in a sum in excess of that provided by the terms of the contracts or certificates of membership issued to plaintiff by defendant company.

3. He admits that at the time the certificates of membership were entered into between the parties hereto, the defendant was conducting and operating a department of its life insurance known as the Safety Fund Department, and that said certificates were issued in said department.

4. He admits that said assessments were levied quarterly on said certificates of insurance.

5. He admits that in the petition herein the plaintiff asks and prays that the court perpetually enjoin the defendant from levying assessments against him in excess of two dollars and sixty-eight cents per assessment per one thousand dollars of insurance in force under said certificate of insurance. And with the exception of that which is herein admitted plaintiff denies each and every other allegation in defendant's answer contained, save and except those allegations contained therein which are admissions of allegations and statements contained in plaintiff's petition.



Second. Plaintiff, for his second reply to defendant's answer, says that in an action heretofore pending in the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut, entitled *Dresser vs. The Hartford Life Insurance Company*, found in the 80th Connecticut Supreme Court Report, at page 681, in which this defendant was there a defendant, and in which case the same form of policy or certificate of insurance as is set forth in plaintiff's petition was then directly involved, the following language quoted by the defendant in its answer from the certificate of insurance held by the plaintiff, to wit: "The rates decrease in proportion as the total indemnity in force increases above one million dollars," was construed by said court to mean that the rates will decrease as the total amount of indemnity increases and that there is no suggestion that they can ever be increased

48 and it was held, determined and adjudged by said court that they, the rates, cannot increase.

Plaintiff says that the determination, order and judgment of said court is still in full force and effect, unreversed and unmodified, and that by reason thereof the construction given by said court to said certificate of insurance is binding upon said defendant and is res judicata of the claims made by said defendant to the contrary, in its said answer.

[Duly verified.]

SMITH W. BENNETT.

*Report of Referee, George B. Okey.*

[Filed November 28, 1919.]

Upon motion of the plaintiff for a reference of the cause to take the evidence of the parties and witnesses, to determine the questions of law and fact involved herein and to state thereon his conclusions separately, the court, finding that the cause is one in which the parties are not entitled by the Constitution to a trial by a jury, ordered

that said cause be referred to Honorable George B. Okey, who as such referee, is directed to reduce the testimony of the parties and witnesses to writing and to have the testimony thereof subscribed by each witness, unless the signature thereto is waived by the parties hereto.

Said referee further has authority to settle all questions of pleadings in said cause and to permit parties hereto to amend or supplement the pleadings herein if necessary, and that said referee make report to this court under this order without delay."

49 The undersigned, assuming that the court intended by its order to confer upon him the general powers of a referee under the Code of Civil Procedure, having taken the required oath, proceeded, at the convenience of the parties, to take the testimony offered, and upon the conclusion thereof, to hear and to consider arguments and briefs of the respective counsel.

The plaintiff in the action seeks to compel the defendant to account for certain payments claimed to have been made by him to it in excess of those contemplated in a membership certificate in the Safety Fund Department of the defendant company, in the sum of \$3,000, issued to him on the 4th day of May, 1882.

The demurrer and the amended demurrer of the defendant to the petition, challenging the jurisdiction of the court over it and the subject matter of the cause, having been overruled, the defendant, in its answer, again specifically challenges such jurisdiction, and alleges that the granting of the relief prayed for by the plaintiff would deprive it of its property without due process of law, contrary to and in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

It further alleges that all of the assessments complained of by the plaintiff were levied for the purpose of paying the death losses incurred by the death of members holding certificates similar to those of the plaintiff in the Safety Fund Department of the defendant company, and that the proceeds of said assessments have been applied to the payments of death losses.

50 The defendant further alleges that the plaintiff voluntarily and without coercion, improper influence or protest, paid each of the several assessments made and levied upon the certificate held by the plaintiff, and is now estopped to deny the validity or propriety thereof; and further alleges that the larger portion of the alleged cause of action did not accrue within six years next before the commencement of the action, and is therefore barred by the statute of limitations.

### Findings of Fact.

Your referee, from the evidence adduced before him, finds and concludes the facts to be as follows:

The defendant company was created by act of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, originally under the name of The Hartford Accident Insurance Company. Under authority of successive legislative acts, it changed its name first to that of The Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company, later to that of The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company and finally to that of The Hartford Life Insurance Company.

On or about the 4th day of May, 1882, the defendant company issued to the plaintiff a certificate of membership in its Safety Fund Department, for the sum of \$3,000. The following is a copy of one of said certificates:

51

*Certificate of Membership.*

Benefit Not to Exceed \$3,000.

No. 30031.

Safety Fund Department.

Age. 40.

The

Hartford Life and Annuity Ins. Co.  
of Hartford, Connecticut,

In consideration of the representations, agreements and warranties made in the application herefor, and of the Admission Fee paid; and of the sum of Ten Dollars, to be paid to said Company, on each \$1,000 of the maximum indemnity herein provided for, to create a Safety Fund, as hereinafter described, and of Three Dollars per annum on each \$1,000, for expenses, to be paid as hereinafter conditioned and of the further payment, in accordance with the conditions hereof, of all Mortuary Assessments, does hereby issue this Certificate of Membership in its Safety Fund Department to Robert H. Langdale of Terrace Park, county of Hamilton, state of Ohio, with the following agreements:

That said Company will deposit said sum of Ten Dollars, when received, with the Trustee, named in a contract made with it (of which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust for the uses and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall at the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety Fund shall then amount to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or whenever thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-annual division of the net interest received therefrom by it, pro rata among all the holders of Certificates in force in said Department at such times, who shall have contributed

52 five years prior to the date of any such division their stipulated proportion of said Fund, by applying the same to the payment of their future dues and assessments; and that, whenever said Fund shall amount to One Million Dollars all subsequent receipts therefor shall be divided by the said Company in like manner as the interest. Said Company further agrees that if at any time, after said Fund shall have amounted to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or after five years from January 1, 1880, if that amount shall not have been attained before that date, it shall fail by reason of insufficient membership, or, shall neglect if justly and legally due, to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any Certificate issued in said Department and such Certificate shall be presented for payment to said Trustee by the legal holder thereof, accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as hereinafter provided, of its failure to pay, after demand upon it within the time herein stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be the duty of said Trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and divide the same (less the reasonable charges and expenses for the management and control of said Fund) among all the holders of

Certificates then in force in said Department, or their legal representatives, in the proportion which the amount of each of their Certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole number of such Certificates in force; and that in such event it shall file with said Trustee a correct list under oath, of the names, residences and amounts of the Certificates of all members entitled to participate in such division.

The evidence referred to above to be either certification by said Insurance Company's President or Secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for the period of sixty days from this date. And said Company further agrees that so long as any Certificate of Membership in the Safety Fund Department shall remain in force, said Fund shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose except as above mentioned.

Upon the death of the member aforesaid while this Certificate is in force, all the conditions hereof having been conformed to by said member, and on the receipt by the President or Secretary of said Company of satisfactory proofs of such death, an assessment shall be made upon the holders of all Certificates in force in said Department at the date of such death, according to the table of graduated assessment rates, given hereon, as determined by their respective ages and the number of such Certificates in force at the date of such death, and the sum collected thereon (less ten cents per each member assessed for cost of collection) shall be paid—provided, however, that in no case shall the payment upon this Certificate in the event of such death exceed One Thousand Dollars (less Fifteen Dollars as a post mortem contribution to said Safety Fund, if the deceased member shall not have fully contributed therefor as hereinbefore required, together with any balance due said Company) to his legal representatives within ninety days after the receipt of such proofs, upon presentation and surrender of this Certificate. All such payments to be made at the Home Office of said Company in lawful money of the United States.

54 And said Company further agrees that such Mortuary Assessment shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose other than for the payment of Death Claims, except as above mentioned. This Certificate is Issued by the Company and Accepted by the Member Upon the Following Express Conditions and Agreements:

1. Application Made Part of Contract.—The application on the faith of which this Certificate issues is hereby referred to and made part of this contract.

2. Of Payments.—The person to whom this Certificate is issued agrees to pay to said Company Three Dollars per annum for expenses on the first day of the month after date of issue, and at every anniversary thereafter, so long as this Certificate shall remain in force; or by monthly or other pro rata installments of the same in advance for periods of less than a year. And also agrees to pay said Company, upon each Certificate that shall become a claim, an assess-

ment in accordance with the Table of Graduated Assessment Rates, as printed hereon, within thirty days from day on which notice bears date. And further agrees to pay said Company the sum of Ten Dollars towards Safety Fund, within sixty days from the date of this Certificate, which will entitle the holder hereof to all the advantages under said fund, as set forth in the agreement with the Trustees aforesaid, a copy of which is printed hereon and hereby made a part of this contract; all such payments to be made direct to said Company. But with the written permission of said Company attached hereto, said payment required to be made towards the Safety Fund, or any part thereof, may be postponed and made payable at such other times as shall be named in such permission: And, while the whole or any portion of such payment shall remain unpaid, said Company may apply any sum standing to the credit of this Certificate towards such payment.

3. Conditions of Acceptance.—The holder of this Certificate further agrees and accepts the same upon the express condition that if either the monthly dues, assessments, or the payment of the Ten Dollars towards the Safety Fund, as hereinbefore required, are not paid to said Company on the day due, then this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages or the recovery of any moneys paid for protection while the Certification was in force, either from said Company or the Trustee of the Safety Fund; and that if a legal and just claim to benefit, under the terms of this Certificate, shall arise before said Safety Fund shall have accumulated to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or before January 1, 1885, and the sum collected on the assessment to be made in such event shall be paid over, as hereinbefore stipulated; or such claim shall arise after said Fund shall have accumulated to said amount, or after January 1, 1885, and this Certificate shall be fully settled and surrendered; or if any final division from said Safety Fund, as hereinbefore provided, shall be made by the Trustee thereof on account of this Certificate, then, in such cases, all liability of said Company and of its Safety Fund, on account of this Certificate, shall cease.

4. Mode of Giving Notice.—A printed or written notice, directed to the address of the member, as it appears at the time on the books of the Company, and deposited in the post office at Hartford, or delivered by an agent of the Company, shall be deemed a legal and sufficient notice for all purposes hereof. A transcript of the books of said Company, certified by the Secretary, showing such facts, shall be taken and accepted as conclusive evidence of the mailing of such notice, and of the facts aforesaid, as set forth in such transcript.

5. Change of Residence or Address.—In case of change of residence, post office address, occupation, or name of the member, or his or her legal representatives, it is agreed on the part of the member that notice thereof in writing shall at once be given to the Secretary of the Company. In case of failure to do so, the Company may proceed for all purposes as if no such change had been made.

6. Prohibitions.—If the member named in this Certificate shall be personally engaged in blasting, submarine operations, mining underground, manufacturing poisonous or explosive chemicals, "breaking" or "coupling" on, and "making-up" of, railroad trains, trading or living among savage tribes or nations, or shall be engaged in military or naval service (except in time of peace) without, in each of these cases, having first obtained the written consent of said

57 Company, or shall use alcoholic or narcotic stimulants so as to produce intoxication sufficient to impair his or her health, or to produce delirium tremens, or to cause his or her death, or shall die by self-destruction—feloniously or otherwise—or while intoxicated, or from effects of drunkenness, or in consequence of a duel, or of keeping or visiting unlawful or disreputable resorts, or the violation or attempted violation of the laws of any Nation, State, Province or Municipality, or if there has been any concealment, misrepresentation, or false statement or statement not true made in the application on which this Certificate issues; or if the conditions herein shall not be in all respects observed and performed by the party to whom this Certificate issues; then, and in all such cases, this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages, or the recovery of any moneys paid thereon.

7. Travel and Residence.—The member herein named is at liberty to travel by railroad, sea, lake, or river, by all trains, first-class steamers, or sailing vessels, and to visit or reside in any portion of the world other than the residence named in the application herefor, where inhabited and civilized, and free from epidemics, wars, or internal dissensions.

8. Limitation of Action.—It is expressly understood and agreed that no action shall be maintained, nor recovery had, for any claim upon or by virtue of this Certificate, after the lapse of one year from the death of said member; and if no suit or proceedings for such recovery be commenced within one year from the date of death of said

58 member it shall be deemed a waiver, on the part of all parties concerned, of all rights or claims under or by virtue of this Certificate, and as conclusive evidence against the validity of such claim, and this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages or the recovery of any moneys paid thereon. And it is further expressly agreed, in case any suit or proceeding shall be commenced for the recovery of any claim under this Certificate after the lapse of one year from the death of said member, or when the claim is otherwise illegal or fraudulent, that the person or persons so commencing suit or proceeding, on failure to obtain judgment therefor, shall pay to said Company the sum of two hundred dollars, as its reasonable attorney fees and damages, which sum shall be taxed as costs in the case, and shall be collected as other costs in the suit are collected.

9. Debts and Liens.—It is further agreed that this Certificate shall be charged with any and all amounts that may be owing from the member or beneficiary herein, or their assigns, to said Company at

the time of the payment of this Certificate, and the Company reserves a lien thereon to secure the payment of any such indebtedness, and the right to deduct and withhold the amount of any such account or indebtedness in payment thereof. And that in case any Country, State, or Municipality in which the member of his legal representative may reside shall levy a tax to be paid by said Company on account of any moneys collected hereon, said member agrees to pay the amount of such tax to said Company in addition to the payments hereinbefore named, as part of the payments needed to hold this Certificate in force, upon notice and demand by said Company, either in connection with the payments of assessments and annual dues or otherwise, as said Company may from time to time elect.

10. Assignments.—This Certificate shall not be assigned or transferred, unless notice and copy of this assignment be given to said Company, nor, unless a claim hereunder, made by an assignee, be subject to proof of interest.

11. Powers of Agents.—Agents of the Company can not alter or waive any of the conditions of this Certificate, nor issue permits of any kind, and they are not authorized to make any indorsements hereon, nor to receive money or assessments, dues, or Safety Fund deposits maturing and payable after the issue of this Certificate.

In Witness whereof, the said Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company have, by their President and Secretary, signed and delivered this contract, at Hartford, Conn., this 4th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two.

[SEAL.]

(Signed)

T. R. FOSTER,

*President.*

(Signed) W. A. COWLES,

*Ass. Secretary.*

(Agents of the Company are not authorized to make any indorsements on this certificate.)

#### *Trustee's Contract.*

This agreement, made and entered into this thirty-first day of December, A. D. 1879, by and between the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Connecticut, and located in the City of Hartford in said State, party of the first part; and the Security Company, a like corporation also located at said Hartford, party of the second part; witnesseth:

Whereas, The party of the first part purposes to issue to persons contracting therefor, Certificates of membership in a special department of its business to be known as the Safety Fund Department, and, in consideration of the sum of ten dollars to be received on each one thousand dollars of the amount of each and every such Certifi-

cate for the purpose of creating a Safety Fund, to insert therein sundry agreements with such persons in the following words; to-wit:

"That said Company will deposit said sum of ten dollars, when received, with the Trustee, named in a contract made with it (of which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust for the uses and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall at the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety Fund shall then amount to three hundred thousand dollars, or whenever thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-annual distribution of the net interest received therefrom by it, pro rata among all the holders of Certificates in force in said department at such times,

61 "who shall have contributed five years prior to the date of any such division their stipulated proportion of said Fund,

"by applying the same to the payment of their future dues and assessments; and that, whenever said Fund shall amount to one million dollars all subsequent receipts therefor shall be distributed by the said Company in like manner as the interest."

"Said Company further agrees that if at any time, after said Fund shall have amounted to three hundred thousand dollars, or after five years from January 1, 1880, if that amount shall not have been attained before that date, it shall fail by reason of insufficient membership, or, shall neglect if and legally due, to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any Certificates issued in said department, and such Certificate shall be presented for payment to said Trustee by the legal holder thereof, accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as hereinafter provided, of its failure to pay, after demand upon it within the time herein stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be the duty of said Trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and distribute the same (less the reasonable charges and expenses for the management and control of said Fund) among all the holders of Certificates then in force in said department, or their legal representatives, in the proportion which the amount of each of their Certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole number of such Certificates in force, and that in such event it shall file with said Trustee a correct list

62 "under oath, of the names, residences and amounts of the Certificates of all members entitled to participate in such division. The evidence referred to above to be either certification by said Insurance Company's President or Secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for a period of sixty days from this date."

"And said Company further agrees that so long as any Certificate of membership in its Safety Fund Department shall remain in force, said Fund shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose except as above mentioned."

Now, Therefore, the party of the first part, in consideration of the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained on the part of the



party of the second part and in accordance with its agreement with its Certificate holders, as hereinbefore recited, does hereby appoint the party of the second part Trustee as aforesaid and covenants and agrees with it and its successors in said trust to deposit with said Trustee, as soon as received, the sum of ten dollars on each thousand dollars of the amount of each and every Certificate of membership issued by it in the aforesaid department until said Fund shall amount to one million dollars, to be by said Trustee held in trust and accumulated as hereinafter agreed, and the income thereof, less the reasonable compensation and expense of said trust, to be paid over to the party of the first part, as hereinafter provided, to be used by the

63 party of the first part in accordance with the hereinbefore recited agreements: And when said Trustee shall pay the income, as above, to the party of the first part, or, shall make any other payments from said Fund, as required by the terms hereof, the liability of said Trustee on the amount so paid shall cease; it being understood and agreed that said Fund belongs to the party of the first part, subject to the expressed trusts herein provided.

And the party of the second part, for itself and its successors, in consideration of such deposits and of a reasonable compensation for its services, and the necessary expenses of managing said trust, covenants and agrees with the party of the first part and its successors and with each of the holders of the aforesaid Certificates that it will receive, hold, manage and dispose of all said deposits made with it by said Insurance Company, principal and income, in accordance with the uses and purposes specified in the hereinbefore recited agreements of the party of the first part with its Certificate holders; and shall at all reasonable times exhibit to the party of the first part all the securities and investments composing said Trust Fund; and shall render true statements of the account of said funds and the income thereof to any person entitled to request the same by reason of an interest therein; said party of the first part hereby agreeing to keep the party of the second part correctly informed of the names, addresses, numbers and amounts of Certificates of all persons thus entitled.

64 That, as often as the sum composing such Fund shall be in amount sufficient to purchase one thousand dollars, par value, of United States Bonds, said Trustee shall make investments of such funds therein and register the same in its name as Trustee of the Safety Fund of the said Insurance Company, and, provided no default by the party of the first part as hereinbefore recited shall occur, shall accumulate said Fund and the income thereof (less the reasonable compensation and expenses), for five years from July 1, 1879, or until such time thereafter as such Fund shall amount to three hundred thousand dollars, par value, of the securities purchased for said Fund, when the party of the second part will pay over to the party of the first part, semi-annually thereafter, all the further income from said Fund (less the accruing and unpaid compensation and expenses), to be by the party of the first part used for the purposes mentioned in the hereinbefore recited agreements: And, unless such default shall occur, will thereafter add to the principal of

said Fund the deposits thereafter received from the party of the first part, exclusive of the income therefrom, until the whole Fund shall amount in such securities at their par value, to one million dollars: And in the event of the failure or neglect mentioned in the hereinbefore recited agreements, will convert said Fund into money and distribute the same in accordance with the hereinbefore recited agreements, as soon as can reasonably be done after the necessary information of the proper persons and their shares shall have been obtained: Said party of the first part hereby agreeing to put the party of the second part in possession of the information required for the making of a proper distribution thereof as agreed with its Certificate holders.

65 All payments required hereby to be made to the party of the first part to cease upon the aforesaid failure or neglect of the party of the first part; and all payments required herein to be made to the Certificate holders by the party of the second part to be made at the office of said Trustee or of the successor in said trust.

The necessary expenses connected with the management of said Fund shall be limited to the ordinary commissions for purchasing or selling and transfer or transmission of the hereinbefore mentioned securities, together with the cost of the stationery and postage used in replying to requests for information of the condition of said Fund and the actual cost of any judicial action needed to determine the legal status of said Fund: All other expenses to be included in and covered by such reasonable charge as shall be made for the compensation of the trusteeship, to be determined by the amount of time and labor involved in the execution thereof.

It is hereby mutually understood and agreed by both parties hereto that all the hereinbefore recited agreements of the party of the first part with the Certificate holders shall constitute the uses and purposes of the trust expressed herein. And it is hereby further understood and agreed that at such time as it shall be shown that all Certificates of membership issued by the party of the first part in its Safety Fund Department, have been legally settled and surrendered to it, or properly canceled in accordance with their terms, it shall be held and considered that the uses and purposes of said

trust have been fully accomplished by said Insurance Company, and the balance of said Fund, if any, shall be paid over to the party of the first part.

66 And it is further understood and agreed that if said party of the second part shall, for any cause, fail to perform its duties as such Trustee as hereinbefore specified, or if, by reason of financial embarrassment of the party of the second part, or other cause, it shall be deemed expedient to remove said trust from its hands, then a new Trustee may be appointed, by the mutual nomination of said Insurance Company, and the then Insurance Commissioner of the State of Connecticut, to succeed to said trust, with all the duties and obligations herein imposed upon said original Trustee, and said party of the second part shall surrender said Fund to such successor.

In Witness Whereof, the party of the first part has affixed hereunto the corporate seal of said Insurance Company and caused these presents to be signed by its President and Secretary.

And the party of the second part has hereto affixed its corporate seal and its President and Treasurer have hereunto set their hands.

Done in duplicate at Hartford in the State of Connecticut the day and year first above written.

[SEAL.]

HARTFORD LIFE AND ANNUITY  
INS. CO.,

By E. H. CROSBY,  
*President, and*

STEPHEN BALL,  
*Secretary.*

[SEAL.]

SECURITY COMPANY,  
By ROBERT E. DAY,

*President, and*  
WILLIAM L. MATSON,  
*Treasurer.*

67 *Table of Graduated Assessment Rates for Death Losses for  
Every \$1,000 of a Total Indemnity of \$1,000,000.*

Age.	Rate.	Age.	Rate.	Age.	Rate.
15 to 21....	\$0.65	35....	\$0.97	48....	\$1.35
22....	.67	36....	1.00	49....	1.40
23....	.69	37....	1.03	50....	1.47
24....	.71	38....	1.06	51....	1.54
25....	.73	39....	1.09	52....	1.63
26....	.75	40....	1.12	53....	1.72
27....	.77	41....	1.14	54....	1.81
28....	.79	42....	1.16	55....	1.92
29....	.81	43....	1.18	56....	2.03
30....	.83	44....	1.20	57....	2.15
31....	.85	45....	1.22	58....	2.32
32....	.88	46....	1.25	59....	2.50
33....	.91	47....	1.30	60....	2.68
34....	.94				

These rates decrease in proportion as the total indemnity in force increases above one million dollars in amount, and are calculated so as to cover the usual expense for collecting.

Received of The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, of Hartford, Conn. —, in full for all claims under this Certificate. No. —, on the life of — — —, deceased.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Beneficiary.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Beneficiary.*

Witness:

(Back of Policy.)

This Company has no agents authorized to receive money on Assessments, Dues, or Safety Fund.

No. 30031.

Safety Fund Department.

Certificate of Membership.

Benefit Not to Exceed \$3,000.

Issued by the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Co.,  
Hartford, Conn.

Name, Robert H. Langdale.

Agent, B. F. Coon.

Read carefully all the conditions of this certificate.

No person should be a party to a contract without knowing all its conditions.

After an Agent has delivered this Certificate, and collected the Admission Fee, no other payment connected with the indemnity under this Certificate must be made to the agent without the production of a receipt signed by the Company's Secretary.

Always give Number of this Certificate in writing to Home Office.

69 Shortly after the certificates in question had been issued to the plaintiff, the defendant company made an effort to secure his assent, and that of other persons in the State of Ohio holding like certificates, to a change or modification of the terms thereof, through means of a printed slip or rider to be signed by the certificate holder, and to be attached thereto, whereby he consented that assessments might be levied against his certificate in the same manner and for like amounts at the same attained age, as were levied against such certificates prior to the issuance of the particular certificate, which it was so sought to change. The effect of which was to abrogate the provision in the table of rates that after the holder arrived at the age of sixty years the rate should be \$2.68 for every \$1,000 of a total indemnity of \$1,000,000, and to permit an assessment, after the age of sixty years, up to \$4. The plaintiff, upon application to him by the special agent of the defendant company, who had been sent to him to secure his consent, refused to sign the slip or rider, or consent to the proposed change.

The plaintiff paid all the assessments upon his certificate of membership that were issued and levied thereon by the defendant company, up to and including the assessment levied on the 24th day of February, 1914, after which time he ceased paying the same.

The following table shows the assessments that were issued by the defendant and paid by the plaintiff after he reached the age of sixty years, which occurred on the 4th day of August, 1903, together with the mortality ratios actually used in each instance by the defendant company, the excess beyond the rate of \$2.68, with interest thereon computed up to the first day of September, 1919.

70	Date.	Quarterly call.	Amt. of insurance.	Age rate used.	Mortality ratio used.	Assessments.	Overcharge.	Interest.
	1903.							
	September	100	\$3,000	\$2.86	\$3.25	\$27.89	\$1.76	\$1.37
	December	101	3,000	2.86	2.80	24.03	1.52	1.16
	1904.							
	March	102	3,000	2.86	3.30	28.32	1.79	1.34
	June	103	3,000	2.86	3.80	32.58	2.03	1.49
	September	104	3,000	3.08	3.80	35.10	4.55	3.28
	December	105	3,000	3.08	3.60	33.27	4.33	3.05
	1905.							
	March	106	3,000	3.08	3.60	33.27	4.33	2.99
	June	107	3,000	3.08	3.80	35.10	4.55	3.07
	September	108	3,000	3.30	3.60	35.67	6.73	4.44
	December	109	3,000	3.30	3.80	37.62	7.07	4.56
	1906.							
	March	110	3,000	3.30	3.80	37.62	7.07	4.45
	June	111	3,000	3.30	3.50	34.65	6.51	4.00
	September	112	3,000	3.65	3.75	41.07	10.92	6.55
	December	113	3,000	3.65	3.20	35.04	9.31	5.45
	1907.							
	March	114	3,000	3.65	3.50	38.34	10.20	5.81
	June	115	3,000	3.65	3.55	42.60	14.06	7.80
	September	116	3,000	4.00	3.20	38.40	12.67	6.81
	December	117	3,000	4.00	3.00	36.00	11.88	6.24

Date.	Quarterly call.	Amt. of insurance.	Age rate used.	Mortality ratio used.	Assessments.	Overcharge.	Interest.
1908.							
March .....	118	3,000	4.00	3.20	38.40	12.67	6.46
June .....	119	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	15.05	7.45
September .....	120	3,000	4.00	3.60	43.20	14.26	6.84
December .....	121	3,000	4.00	3.30	39.60	13.07	6.07
1909.							
March .....	122	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	15.05	6.77
June .....	123	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	15.05	6.55
71							
September .....	124	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	15.05	6.32
December .....	125	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	6.74
1910.							
March .....	126	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	6.49
June .....	127	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	6.24
September .....	128	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	5.99
December .....	129	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	5.74
1911.							
March .....	130	3,000	4.00	4.40	52.80	17.42	5.75
June .....	131	3,000	4.00	4.40	52.80	17.42	5.49
September .....	132	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	4.99
December .....	133	3,000	4.00	4.35	52.20	17.23	4.91

1912.									
March .....	134	3,000	4.00	3.95	47.40	31.76	15.64	4.22	
June .....	135	3,000	4.00	5.65	67.80	45.43	22.37	5.70	
September .....	136	3,000	4.00	5.15	61.80	41.41	20.39	4.89	
December .....	137	3,000	4.00	3.77	45.24	30.31	14.93	3.33	
1913.									
March .....	138	3,000	4.00	3.95	47.40	31.76	15.64	3.28	
June .....	139	3,000	4.00	5.94	71.28	47.76	23.52	4.59	
September .....	140	3,000	4.00	4.86	58.32	39.07	19.25	3.46	
December .....	141	3,000	4.00	4.10	49.26	32.96	16.30	2.69	
1914.									
March .....	142	3,000	4.00	5.63	67.58	45.27	22.31	3.35	
							<u>\$543.68</u>	<u>\$208.23</u>	
Over Charge .....									
Interest to September 1st, 1916 .....							\$543.68		
Interest from September 1st, 1916, to Sept. 1st, 1919 .....							\$751.91		
							97.86		
Total .....							<u>\$849.77</u>		

72 The case of Douds vs. The Hartford Life Insurance Company, now pending before this court and this referee, is a parallel case to the instant one, differing only in that in the former case the additional relief is sought of compelling the defendant to specifically perform the provisions of the membership certificate, still in force. Like proceedings in the Court of Common Pleas were had in both cases.

After the demurrers of the defendant company had been overruled in the Douds case, it commenced a proceeding in prohibition in the Supreme Court of Ohio, in which it prayed for a writ of prohibition against the plaintiff and the judges of the Court of Common Pleas of and for Franklin county, Ohio, to prohibit Douds from prosecuting and the judges from proceeding in the case, upon the grounds that the inquiry upon which the relief prayed for here must rest would require a visitation of the affairs of the company, its home office in Hartford, Connecticut; would amount to an interference of the internal management of a foreign corporation, beyond the jurisdiction of the court of any state other than Connecticut; that the courts of other states other than Connecticut could not enforce their decree if granted; that if Douds is entitled to have such relief granted in the courts of Ohio then similar or like remedies must be granted to each of the several members who reside in the several states of the United States; that the granting of such relief would interfere with and destroy the contractual relations between the members of the Safety Fund Department; would impair the unity and integrity of the plan of insurance contemplated in the membership certificates and would amount to an extermination of the business of the company. The further claim was asserted that if the relief prayed for in the action was awarded, it would deprive the company of its property without due process of law, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution.

73 The case was submitted upon a general demurrer to the answer. The Supreme Court, sustaining the demurrer, denied the writ and dismissed the petition. The State ex rel. The Hartford Insurance Co. vs. Douds et al., 96 Ohio State, 604. The case not being otherwise reported, the following is a copy of the journal entry of the court:

"This case came on to be heard on the petition of the relator, answer of the defendants, and the demurrer of the relator to said answer, and was argued by counsel. The court finds that said demurrer searches the record and raises the question of the sufficiency of the facts and allegations set forth in the said petition and the right of the relator upon such facts and allegations to have and receive the relief therein prayed for, and the court now therefore ceasing to consider said demurrer as a demurrer to the petition finds that the same is well taken upon the cases of State ex rel. Nolan v. Clendenen et al., 93 Ohio St., 264; State ex rel. Garrison v. Brown et al., 94 Ohio St., 115; State ex rel. Barbee, Exr., v. Allen, Probate Judge, ante, 10, and State ex rel. Faber v. Jones et al., Judges, Ohio St., 357, in that said facts and allegations of such petition



insufficient, and do not entitle the relator to the relief prayed for, and does therefore sustain such demurrer as a demurrer to said petition.

The relator not desiring to plead further herein it is ordered and adjudged that said demurrer as a demurrer to the petition be and the same is hereby sustained; that the alternative writ heretofore allowed herein be quashed, that the writ of prohibition and relief prayed for by the relator in said petition be and the same is hereby refused and denied, and that said petition be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Writ denied."

Thereupon the defendant company filed a petition for a writ of error in the Supreme Court of the United States to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of Ohio in the prohibition case. *State of Ohio ex rel. Hartford Life Insurance Co. v. Douds et al.*, 245 U. S., 642. On motion of the defendant in error to affirm the judgment below, the court, on January 28, 1918, made the following order:

"Per curiam: Dismissed for want of jurisdiction upon the authority of Sec. 237, Judicial Code, as amended by act of Congress, September 6, 1916, c. 448, 39 Stat., 726; *Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company vs. Gilbert*, 245 U. S., 162."

After the proceedings in the Supreme Court of Ohio and the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Douds case, above stated, had been concluded, the defendant company filed a petition in prohibition in the Supreme Court of Ohio, in the Langdale case. The Common Pleas Court had overruled demurrer to the petition challenging the jurisdiction in like manner as in the Douds case. The court denied the writ. See *The State ex rel. The Hartford Life Insurance Co. vs. Langdale*, 98 Ohio St., 470, wherein, without other or further report it is stated:

"Writ denied on authority of *State ex rel. The Hartford Life Insurance Co. vs. Douds et al.*, 96 Ohio State, 604."

Thereupon the defendant company filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, a petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Ohio in the Langdale case. The court denied the writ. See *State of Ohio ex rel. The Hartford Life Insurance Co. vs. Robert H. Langdale*, 248 U. S., 564, wherein, without other report, it is stated:

"Petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, denied."

#### Conclusions of Law.

Your referee, upon the issues joined and involved, has reached certain conclusions of law, which he proceeds to state.

### The Question of Jurisdiction.

The question of paramount importance in the case is the one of jurisdiction.

In the light of the proceedings in the Court of Common Pleas, overruling the demurrers of the defendant company to the petition in the Supreme Court of Ohio, in denying the writ of prohibition in the Douds and Langdale cases and in the Supreme Court of the United States in dismissing the petition for a writ of error in the Douds case and in denying the petition for a writ of certiorari in the Langdale case, the referee cannot feel that the question of jurisdiction, as to him, is an open one, but on the contrary, is *res judicata*.

In the Douds prohibition case, the writ was denied apparently on the ground that the writ of prohibition will not issue to prohibit the Court of Common Pleas from determining its own jurisdiction. That this was the ground of its decision is to be inferred from the citation of authorities in the journal entries of the court, the case not being otherwise reported. The Hartford Life Insurance Company vs. Douds, 96 Ohio St., 604.

The following is a copy of the opinion of Judge Kinkead overruling the demurres to the petition in the Douds case:

"The cause of action is to be regarded as one in the nature of specific performance. Plaintiff seeks to have it adjudged that the contract made by him with the company required payment of a premium of only \$2.68 per thousand after arriving at the age of sixty years. He is also asking that, if that be the meaning and intent of the contract, defendant shall be compelled to perform it accordingly—to receive the premiums stipulated and to keep in force the insurance. The claim for the amount of money paid in excess of the contract is incidental to the paramount relief sought.

Counsel for defendant contends that to grant the equitable relief sought would of necessity interfere with the operation of the safety fund department; that such mode of relief employed by the courts of this state, or by the courts of other states than Connecticut, the home of the defendant and the place where the contract was made would interfere with and control the management of the business of the company and with the present and future relations of the members and plans.

It is said that it is essential to the integrity of the safety fund department plan that uniformity in the manner and method of making the assessments shall be maintained through the restriction of the Connecticut courts of jurisdiction over the assessments.

Conclusive answer may be made to the contention by the observation that the contract of insurance must have the same meaning in every state where there are policyholders. There is but one definite plan of assessment and insurance which is prescribed by the contract.

A holder of a certificate of membership issued by defendant enters into a contract with the company which agrees to assess and collect

payments according to the table of graduated rates which is part of the contract. The company, and not the subscribers to other policies, makes the contract. The company, and not the holders of policies, must perform the conditions undertaken by it.

I fail to perceive the logic of counsel (for defendant) in the reference to *State ex rel. Hartford Life Insurance Company vs. Shain*, 245 Mo., 78, where it is stated that the Missouri Court held that the equitable relief there sought, being the same as here, came within the rule which forbids courts other than those of the home jurisdiction of the association from interfering with or controlling the action of the association in its relation to its members.

It would be anomalous to require a holder of a policy by one in Ohio to go to the home of the defendant in Connecticut to compel it to perform its contract according to its terms and conditions. Compelling defendant to carry out its contract according to its terms and conditions is not an interference with the action of the company in its relation to its members."

The foregoing opinion, upholding the jurisdiction is, of course, conclusive upon the referee.

But if the question was open and the referee was called upon, under the order of reference, to report his conclusions upon it, he would feel impelled to uphold the jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction of the subject matter is always to be presumed and this is especially true in states which have constitutional provisions like our Section 15 of the Bill of Rights, which provides:

"Section 16. All courts shall be open and every person, for an injury done him in his land, goods, person or reputation, shall have remedy by due course of law, and shall have justice administered without denial or delay."

A contract is here involved which was entered into in Ohio by one of our citizens with a Connecticut corporation. The defendant has established a domicile of business in this state and, in assuming that domicile, subjects itself, the same as an individual or a domestic corporation, to the jurisdiction of our courts with respect to contracts made with citizens of our state. It must be taken to assent to such jurisdiction when it comes into the state to transact business. The plaintiff should not be driven to the courts of the state of Connecticut for the assertion of his rights, whatever they may be, under his contract, unless the reasons therefor are imperative.

The action is one to recover back payments made by the plaintiff to the defendant in excess of those called for by the contracts. The defendant insists that the inquiry into the matter of payments of assessments claimed to have been levied and paid in excess of those provided for in the contract would involve an interference with the internal affairs of the company, beyond the jurisdiction of any court other than that of the domicile of the defendant.

79 The contracts in question provided that upon the death of a member:

"An assessment shall be made upon the holders of all certificates in force in said department at the date of said death according to the table of graduated assessment rates given hereon, as determined by their respective ages and the number of such certificates in force at the date of such death."

The table of graduated assessments on the certificate ran from the age of fifteen to sixty years. The specified rate at the age of sixty years was \$2.68. There was no rate specified beyond that age, nor was there anything in the contracts which gave to the company any discretionary power or authority to levy special assessments other than those provided for in the table.

The company adopted the custom of levying assessments quarterly. Assessments were levied against the plaintiff and paid by him after he had reached the age of sixty years, beyond the sum of \$2.68.

The method of ascertaining an assessment to be levied did not involve the exercise of discretionary powers upon the part of the officers of the defendant company. It required a simple mathematical calculation. The number of outstanding certificates were ascertained. The number of deaths since the last assessment were ascertained. One divided into the other gave the mortality ratio, and that, in each instance was multiplied by the rate specified in the certificate contract, at the age attained by the holder, thus producing the amount of the assessment. It is true, that we have not, in evidence, before the court, the number of outstanding certificates

80 nor the number of deaths, at the time each assessment was levied, but we have here in evidence the amount of each assessment levied per \$1,000 and the mortality ratios actually ascertained and used by the company at each assessment period. And we have the respective amounts paid by the plaintiff after he reached the age of sixty years together with the dates of payment. Thus, without going into the books or disturbing or interfering with the internal affairs of the company, all the factors are before the court necessary to ascertain the amounts of the assessment levied against and paid by the plaintiff in excess of the contract and to grant the relief prayed for.

The plaintiff was entitled to have the ascertained ratio multiplied by \$2.68, the amount specified in his contract after reaching the age of sixty years, instead of a larger sum. He was not bound by a calculation which compelled him to contribute at a rate beyond the terms of his contract. The rights of other certificate holders are not involved. They are not before the court. These certificates of membership amounted to an ordinary life insurance contract, containing a definite agreement as to benefits and terms of payment of premiums with no reservation of authority upon the part of the company to vary their terms.

It seems to the referee that in cases, where the courts, having before them contracts of similar import to those here involved, and where like relief was sought, have refused to proceed, such refusal was

rather a matter of expediency than want of jurisdiction. Our courts, having jurisdiction of the parties may decree an accounting under circumstances such as are here involved in accordance with well settled doctrine of equity jurisprudence. They must have before them the necessary evidence upon which to base a decree. If the proof is not available the party fails, but as to the power of the court to entertain the action there can be no question.

It will be noted that the action is not one to compel or enforce an assessment, or to determine the extent of the interest of the plaintiff in the Safety Fund of the defendant or the method of the distribution thereof. To grant the relief prayed for will not disturb the Safety Fund nor in anywise interfere with the internal management and operation of the defendant company. It will simply require the defendant, over which the court has jurisdiction, to live up to a contract entered into in Ohio with an Ohio citizen. Plaintiff does not sue as one of a class. Other certificates are not involved. The result here cannot affect any other certificate holder. A decree in accordance with the prayer of the petition will impose no other or different conditions or burdens upon the defendant than have already been imposed upon it by the courts of the state of its adoption. The referee does not feel that it is incumbent upon him to review the numerous cases, many of which are quite similar in their facts to the instant case, and some of which are in direct conflict, upon the question of jurisdiction, in view of the conclusions already reached by the courts to which he is subordinate. In upholding the jurisdiction, he is content to follow in their footsteps.

### Voluntary Payments.

It is contended, as matter of defense, by the defendant, that the assessments levied against the plaintiff were paid voluntarily by him, with knowledge and the means of knowledge of all the facts, and that he is therefore estopped to deny or challenge the validity or propriety thereof.

The soundness of the general proposition that a payment voluntarily made, as applied to parties acting at arm's length, cannot be recovered back, is well settled. But the doctrine has no application in cases where such confidential relations exist between the parties as that one is entitled to rely on the good faith of the other. It is equally well settled that payments, although voluntarily made, will be inquired into by the courts and money received by the party performing the duty to the other party to protect his interests, will be restored to him if he has been imposed upon and injured by reason of the fiduciary relation.

The plaintiff had the right to rely upon the good faith of the defendant and that, in making the assessments, it would do so in accordance with the terms of his contract. He had no means of knowing when notice of the amount of an assessment came to his hands, whether or not it had been levied according to his specified rate because he had not the factors necessary to its computation. They

were exclusively in the possession of the defendant. Relying upon the good faith of the managers of the defendant, he could only assume that the assessments were legal and proper and pay them. Such payments are not voluntary within the purview of the general doctrine relating to voluntary payments and their finality.

The referee concludes, as a matter of law, that the defendant is not estopped from demanding an accounting by the defendant for the amounts of assessments paid by him at a rate in excess of \$2.68 called for in his contract.

#### Statute of Limitations.

The defendant, as matter of defense, invoked the six year Statute of Limitations, and insists that if it be held that the plaintiff is entitled to recover, that in computing the amount the same should be limited to the alleged excesses in the assessments to the six years immediately preceding the commencement of the action.

The assessments levied by the defendant company were received by it in a trust capacity which continued and subsisted. Section 11236 of the General Code provides:

"Section 11236. The provisions of this chapter, respecting lapse of time as a bar to suit, shall not apply in the case of a continuing and subsisting trust."

The referee concludes, as a matter of law, that the Statute of Limitations does not apply to the payments in question for the reason that they were received in a trust capacity, within the contemplation of Section 11236 of the General Code, and that, therefore, the defense of the Statute of Limitations is not well taken.

#### Conclusion.

The referee concludes that the plaintiff is entitled to a decree, prayed for in the petition, requiring the defendant to account for assessments paid by the plaintiff in excess of the contract rate, in the sum of \$849.77, with interest thereon from the first day September, 1919.

Respectfully submitted,

GEO. B. OKEY,  
Referee.

#### Supplemental Report.

On Wednesday, the 12th day of November, 1919, the referee announced his decision in this case, and delivered to counsel for the respective parties a copy of his report, and notified counsel that he would file with the clerk of the common pleas court his decision and report herein on the 28th day of November, 1919.

Counsel for defendant thereupon gave notice of his intention to file herein a motion for a new trial.

Thereupon, on Friday, the 14th day of November, 1919, the defendant by its counsel filed with and submitted to the referee the following motion, to wit:

*Motion of Defendant to Vacate Report of Referee and for New Trial.*

1. Now comes the defendant and moves that the report of the referee herein be vacated, set aside, and held for naught, for the following reasons:

(a) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action.

(b) That the referee under the order of reference herein was not authorized or empowered to make special findings of fact and conclusions of law, but that his authority was limited solely to taking of the testimony of the witnesses and reporting the same to the court.

2. If the for-going motion be overruled, the defendant moves that the report of the referee be vacated and a new trial granted, for the following causes affecting materially its substantial rights:

(a) Error in the amount of recovery in that it is too large.

(b) Errors of the referee in the admission of evidence offered by the plaintiff, to which the defendant at the time excepted.

(c) The report is not sustained by sufficient evidence.

(d) The report is contrary to law.

(e) Errors of law occurring at the trial and excepted to by the defendant.

(f) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of this defendant.

(g) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action.

(h) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction to grant the relief prayed for by the plaintiff herein.

(i) The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the referee constitute a regulation and control of the conduct of the internal affairs of this defendant at its domicile in the State of Connecticut, and extend the jurisdiction of the courts of this state beyond the boundaries thereof, and interfere with a subject matter which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of Connecticut, all of which is contrary to the laws and the Constitution of the State of Ohio and to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and further, a judgment or decree of the plaintiff upon such report of the referee would deprive this

defendant of its property without due process of law, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY,  
By JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT,  
ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Its Attorneys.*

And thereupon, on Saturday, the 15th day of November, 1912, the defendant by its counsel filed with and submitted to the referee the following objections and exceptions to his report, to wit:

*Objections and Exceptions of Defendant to Report of Referee.*

Now comes the defendant without prejudice to or waiving any of its rights or remedies under its motion for a new trial filed herein, and says if said motion is overruled, that in that event it objects and excepts to the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the referee herein, upon the following grounds:

1. Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action.

2. That the referee under the order of reference was not authorized or empowered to make special findings of fact and conclusions of law, but that his authority was limited solely to taking of the testimony of the witnesses and reporting the same to the court.

87 3. Error in the amount of recovery is that it is too large.

4. The report is not sustained by sufficient evidence.

5. The report is contrary to law.

6. Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of the action.

7. Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction to grant the relief prayed for by the plaintiff herein.

8. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the referee constitute a regulation and control of the conduct of the internal affairs of this defendant at its domicile in the State of Connecticut, and extend the jurisdiction of the courts of this state beyond the boundaries thereof, and interfere with a subject matter which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of Connecticut, all of which is contrary to the laws and the Constitution of the State of Ohio and to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and further, a judgment or decree for the plaintiff upon said report of the referee would deprive this defendant of its property.



without due process of law, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY,  
By JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT,  
ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Its Attorneys.*

And thereupon, on Monday, the 17th day of November, 1919, said motion of the defendant for a new trial herein came on to be heard before the referee and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof the referee overrules said motion, to which ruling and decision overruling the same the defendant by its counsel excepted.

And thereupon, on Monday, the 17th day of November, 1919, said objections and exceptions of the defendant to the report of the referee herein came on to be heard before the referee and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof the referee overruled each and all of said objections and exceptions, to which ruling and decision overruling the same the defendant by its counsel excepted.

The defendant thereupon on this 28th day of November, 1919, presented its bill of exceptions and the same on this 28th day of November, 1919, was allowed, signed, sealed and filed with the report of the referee as a part of the record in this case, but not to be spread at large upon the journal.

In the trial of this case, the referee employed Armstrong & Okey, official stenographers, to report and transcribe the testimony and the report of the referee, and there is due them for said services the sum of \$96.85, which should be taxed and paid as part of the costs of this action.

GEO. B. OKEY,  
*Referee.*

Dated November 28, 1919.

*Motion of Defendant to Vacate Report of Referee and for New Trial.*

[Filed November 14, 1919.]

1. Now comes the defendant and moves that the report of the referee herein be vacated, set aside and held for naught, for the following reasons:

(a) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action.

(b) That the referee under the order of reference herein was not authorized or empowered to make special findings of fact and conclusions of law, but that his authority was limited solely to taking

of the testimony of the witnesses and reporting the same to the court.

2. If the foregoing motion is overruled, the defendant moves that the report of the referee be vacated and a new trial granted, for the following causes affecting materially its substantial rights:

- (a) Error in the amount of recovery in that it is too large.
- (b) Errors of the referee in the admission of evidence offered by the plaintiff, to which the defendant at the time excepted.
- (c) The report is not sustained by sufficient evidence.
- (d) The report is contrary to law.
- (e) Errors of law occurring at the trial and excepted to by the defendant.
- (f) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of this defendant.
- (g) Neither the court nor the referee had any jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action.

90 (h) Neither the court nor the referee has any jurisdiction to grant the relief prayed for by the plaintiff herein.

(i) The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the referee constitute a regulation and control of the conduct of the internal affairs of this defendant at its domicile in the state of Connecticut, and extend the jurisdiction of the courts of this state beyond the boundaries thereof, and interfere with a subject matter which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of Connecticut, all of which is contrary to the laws and the Constitution of the State of Ohio and to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and further, a judgment or decree for the plaintiff upon such report of the referee would deprive this defendant of its property without due process of law, contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY,  
By JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT,  
ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Its Attorneys.*

*Motion to Confirm Report of Special Master Commissioner,  
Hon. George B. Okey.*

[Filed January 9, 1920.]

Now comes the plaintiff, by his counsel, and the report of Hon. George B. Okey, as special master commissioner in this cause, having heretofore been filed herein.

The plaintiff moves that the same be confirmed and for an order and decree thereon in conformity thereto.

SMITH W. BENNETT,  
*Attorney for Plaintiff.*

91 In the Court of Appeals, Franklin County, Ohio.

[No. 779.]

ROBERT H. LANGDALE, Plaintiff,

vs.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant.

*Transcript of Docket and Journal Entries.*

1920, March 26.—Appeal bond filed.

1920, March 26.—Transcript of docket and journal entries filed.

1920, March 26.—Eighteen original papers filed.

1920, March 26.—Bill of exceptions filed.

1920, September 20.—Three briefs of plaintiff in error filed.

1920, September 28.—Stipulation filed.

1920, October 5.—Three briefs for defendant in error filed.

1920, October 29.—Motion for new trial filed.

1920, November 8.—Motion for new trial refiled.

1920, November 8.—Motion overruled; judgment against defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, for \$847.77 with interest at 6% from September 1, 1919, as entry; exceptions.

1920, November 13.—Bill of exceptions filed.

92 1920, November 13.—Notice of filing bill of exceptions filed.

1920, November 13.—I served notice on Smith W. Bennett, attorney for plaintiff by mailing to him personally a copy thereof. Guy R. Winegarner, clerk; by A. Egold, deputy.

1920, November 23.—Bill of exceptions transmitted to the court.

1919, November 23.—Bill of exceptions returned by the court.

November 8, 1920.—This cause now coming on for hearing was submitted to the court upon the evidence and proof heretofore taken by the referee and incorporated with the report of such referee and filed in this cause, and upon the pleadings. On consideration whereof the court finds on the issues joined for the plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, and that the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, is indebted to him in the sum of eight hundred forty-seven and 77/100 dollars (\$847.77) with interest thereon at the rate of six per centum from the first day of September, 1919.

This cause further coming on for hearing upon the motion of the defendant to set aside the finding herein, and for a new trial, the court on consideration overrules the same, to each of which findings, orders and rulings the defendant then excepted.

It is therefore considered, adjudged and decreed by the court that the plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, recover from the defendant, The

93 Hartford Life Insurance Company, the sum of eight hundred forty-seven and 77/100 dollars (\$847.77) with interest thereon at the rate of six per centum from the first day of September, 1919, and his costs herein expended, including a fee of \$250.00 heretofore allowed by the Court of Common Pleas to the referee herein, and in all taxed at \$—, to which the defendant then excepted.

This cause further coming on for hearing on the motion of the defendant to set aside such judgment and for a new trial herein, the court on consideration thereof, overrules the same, to each of which foregoing orders, findings, rulings and judgments the defendant then excepted.

[Duly certified.]

*Motion for New Trial.*

[Refiled November 8, 1920.]

Now comes the defendant and moves that the decision, order and judgment of the court herein in favor of the plaintiff be vacated and set aside and that a new trial be granted herein for the following causes affecting materially the substantial rights of the defendant:

(1) That said decision, order and judgment of the court herein, in favor of plaintiff and against defendant, is rendered for too large an amount.

(2) That said decision, order and judgment is not sustained by sufficient evidence and is contrary to law.

(3) That said decision, order and judgment should have been in favor of the defendant.

(4) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that it has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action.

94 (5) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that the assumption of jurisdiction by it herein is not a violation of the rights of the defendant, and is not a taking of its property and a denial of due process of law, under and against the provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(6) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that the payments by plaintiff, sought to be recovered herein, were not voluntarily made so as to preclude recovery by him.

(7) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that plaintiff was not barred from recovery herein by reason of the provisions of the statute of limitations.

(8) Other errors of law, apparent on the face of the record, in said decision, order and judgment, in so entering judgment in favor of

plaintiff and against defendant, upon the evidence submitted in this court.

JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT AND  
ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Attorneys for Defendant.*

95

*Bill of Exceptions.*

[Filed November 13, 1920.]

Present:

Smith W. Bennett, on behalf of the Plaintiff.  
Arnold & Game, on behalf of the Defendant.

Be it remembered, that on the trial of the above entitled cause, at the September Term, A. D. 1920, of the Court of Appeals of Franklin county, Ohio, before Hons. James I. Allread, H. L. Ferneding and Albert H. Kunkle, judges, to maintain the issues on behalf of the respective parties hereto to be maintained, the parties, plaintiff and defendant, entered into a certain stipulation in writing, which was filed herein on the twenty-eighth day of September, A. D. 1920, which said stipulation, with the caption omitted, is in the words and figures following, to wit:

*Stipulation as to Submission.*

It is stipulated by and between the respective parties in the above entitled cause that the same shall be submitted herein upon the evidence and proof heretofore taken before the referee and incorporated with the report of said referee and filed in this cause, and the pleadings and exhibits filed in this cause.

(Signed)

SMITH W. BENNETT,  
*Attorney for Plaintiff.*

(Signed)

ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Attorneys for Defendant.*

96

And thereupon, pursuant to said stipulation, all the evidence and proof heretofore taken before the referee, was offered and admitted in evidence on behalf of the respective parties hereto, all objections and exceptions appearing therein being preserved to the party making the same as if originally raised and saved on this trial of this cause, which said evidence and proof is hereto attached, marked Exhibit "AA" and made a part hereof.

And thereupon the plaintiff rested.

And thereupon the defendant rested.

And the foregoing was all of the evidence introduced, offered or admitted on behalf of the plaintiff and on behalf of the defendant on this trial of this cause.

And thereupon, on the issues joined, the court found in favor of the plaintiff, ordering, adjudging and decreeing that the plaintiff, Robert H. Langdale, recover from the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, the sum of \$847.77, together with interest thereon at the rate of six per cent from the first day of September, 1919, and his cost herein expended, including a fee of \$250.00 allowed to the said referee and in all taxed at \$—.

And thereupon the said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, to each and all of said findings, orders, judgments and decrees aforesaid in favor of said plaintiff and against said defendant at the time excepted and still excepts thereto.

And thereupon the defendant filed with the clerk of said court and submitted to said court its certain motion for a new trial, which said motion for a new trial, with the caption omitted is in the words and figures following, to wit:

97

*Motion for New Trial.*

Now comes the defendant and moves that the decision, order and judgment of the court herein in favor of the plaintiff be vacated and set aside and that a new trial be granted herein for the following causes affecting materially the substantial rights of the defendant:

(1) That said decision, order and judgment of the court herein, in favor of plaintiff and against defendant, is rendered for too large an amount.

(2) That said decision, order and judgment is not sustained by sufficient evidence and is contrary to law.

(3) That said decision, order and judgment should have been in favor of the defendant.

(4) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that it has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action.

(5) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that the assumption of jurisdiction by it herein is not a violation of the rights of the defendant, and is not a taking of its property and a denial of due process of law, under and against the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(6) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that the payments by plaintiff, sought to be recovered herein, were not voluntarily made so as to preclude recovery by him.

(7) That this court erred in deciding, ordering and adjudging that plaintiff was not barred from recovery herein by reason of the provisions of the statute of limitations.

98

(8) Other errors of law, apparent on the face of the record in said decision, order and judgment, in so entering judgment

ment in favor of plaintiff and against defendant, upon the evidence submitted in this court.

(Signed)

JONES, HOCKER, SULLIVAN &  
ANGERT,  
ARNOLD & GAME,  
*Attorneys for Defendant.*

And thereupon the court overruled said motion for a new trial so filed as aforesaid by said defendant, to which ruling of the court in overruling said motion for a new trial the said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, at the time excepted and still excepts thereto.

And thereupon the court entered up judgment as aforesaid in favor of said plaintiff and against said defendant in the sum of \$847.77 with 6% interest from September 1, 1919, to which ruling of the court in entering up judgment as aforesaid in favor of said plaintiff and against said defendant, the said defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company, at the time excepted and still excepts thereto and on the thirteenth day of November, A. D. 1920, filed this its bill of exceptions in said cause.

And thereupon the clerk of said court having forthwith notified the plaintiff of the filing of this bill of exceptions, and no objection or amendment to said bill of exceptions having been filed by said plaintiff said clerk on the twenty-third day of November, 1920, presented to Hons. James I. Allread, H. L. Ferneding and Albert H. Kunkle, trial judges as aforesaid, this bill of exceptions for allowance and signature by said court as provided by statute.

99 And thereupon the court received this bill of exceptions on the twenty-third day of November, A. D. 1920, and said court did on the twenty-third day of November, A. D. 1920, certify that the foregoing was all of the evidence offered, introduced and as admitted on behalf of the plaintiff and on behalf of the defendant on this trial of this cause and did allow, sign and seal this bill of exceptions as provided by statute and did immediately transmit the same to the office of the clerk of said court to be made a part of the record herein but not spread at large upon the journal, according to the statute in such case made and provided, all of which is accordingly done as of said September Term, A. D. 1920, of said court.

JAMES I. ALLREAD,  
H. L. FERNEDING,  
ALBERT H. KUNKLE,  
*Judges of said Court.*

*Proceedings Before Honorable George B. Okey, Referee, Beginning  
Wednesday, January 22, 1919.*

**Appearances:**

Mr. Smith W. Bennett,  
On behalf of the Plaintiff.  
Messrs. Arnold & Game,  
On behalf of the Defendant.

Be it remembered, that on the hearing of the above entitled cause, before Honorable George B. Okey, referee herein, and before the introduction of any evidence herein the following proceedings were had and objections, rulings and exceptions were noted:

100

Morning Session,  
Wednesday, January 22, 1919.

The Referee: You may proceed, gentlemen. The matters set for hearing are the cases of Alonzo J. Doud vs. The Hartford Life Insurance Company, Number 74362, and Robert H. Langdale vs. The Hartford Life Insurance Company, Number 72527.

Mr. Game: I appear on behalf of the defendant under protest and object to the jurisdiction of the court over the subject matter of this action. The defendant reserves all of its rights as raised by its demurrer and amended demurrer to the petition herein, and also under its special defense in its answer, objection to the jurisdiction of the court over the subject matter of this action.

Mr. Bennett: On behalf of the plaintiff I wish to inquire of the referee whether or not he has received from the clerk a copy of the reply filed to the answer.

The Referee: Yes, it is with the papers.

Mr. Bennett: I will be ready on behalf of the plaintiff to proceed with the case on the twenty-ninth instant.

Mr. Game: Mr. James C. Jones of St. Louis is associate counsel for the defendant in this case, and I would like to communicate with him as to the time of the hearing; otherwise the twenty-ninth would be satisfactory to local counsel.

Mr. Bennett: On the part of the plaintiff we have heretofore taken the deposition of a Mr. Frey who, I understand, is absent from the city. The presentation of the case on the part of the plaintiff in chief will be very brief. I will be ready on the twenty-ninth to make

101 a statement of the plaintiff's case, and of my knowledge of the proceedings thus far. These particular cases are two of a series of five cases and they have heretofore been held in abeyance awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, to which court error proceedings had been prosecuted from the judgment of the Supreme Court of Ohio in an original action of prohibition in each of these cases. The record has been duly certified back from the Supreme Court of the United States and the order of reference has been made after the questions have again been canvassed before Judge Kinkead. I merely state this as preliminary to a full statement on a week from today, and if counsel are ready at that time—which of course the plaintiff understands will be under protest the same as expressed here, I think we will be ready to submit our case.

The Referee: Well, the cases are set for hearing then for January 29, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

And thereupon the further hearing of this case was adjourned until January 29, A. D. 1919, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.



Morning Session, January 29, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this case was, by agreement, adjourned to January 31, 1919, at two o'clock p. m.

Afternoon Session, January 31, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this case was resumed pursuant to adjournment.

Present:

Hon. George B. Okey, Referee.

Smith W. Bennett, on behalf of the plaintiff.

F. H. Game, on behalf of the defendant.

Mr. Game: If your Honor please, I would like again to state my position in regard to this matter and that is that I appear  
102 under protest on behalf of the defendant and object to the jurisdiction of the court over the person of the defendant and the subject matter of this cause for the reasons and upon the grounds set forth in the demurrer, the amended demurrer to the petition herein and also as set forth in the defendant's answer.

Be it remembered, that on the hearing of the above entitled cause before Hon. George B. Okey, referee, pursuant to the order of reference heretofore made herein, the plaintiff, to maintain the issues on his part to be maintained, introduced and offered in testimony on his behalf the following evidence, to wit:

Mr. Bennett: Here is a deposition in the Langdale case No. 73527, which I ask the referee to open and mark as opened.

Mr. Bennett: I now offer the original certificate in the Langdale case, consisting of four pages, and ask that it be marked as Exhibit "A."

And thereupon the paper last above offered was marked for the purpose of identification as Exhibit "A" and is hereto attached, so marked and made part hereof.

Mr. Bennett: I now offer the deposition of George D. Frey, who at the time of the taking of the deposition resided in the city of Columbus, Ohio, but since said time, as I am advised, has become a non-resident. I would suggest that the deposition be not read at length but that the objections and exceptions thereto be argued at length when we come to the presentation of the case.

Mr. Game: Since the deposition is not read the defendant objects  
103 to questions and answers Nos. 7 to 72, both inclusive for the reason and upon the grounds that the same are incompetent, immaterial and irrelevant. This objection is to be noted to each question and answer.

And thereupon the above deposition was marked for the purposes of identification as Exhibit "B" and is hereto attached, so marked and made part hereof.

Mr. Bennett: Your Honor, I am seeking to cover the balance of my case by stipulation and I think it will be rather brief. I intend limiting it to a waiver of producing the company's receipts for these various assessments and to the further proposition that the payments made by the plaintiff upon said certificates were paid by him to maintain the insurance in force. All the rest I conceive to be questions of law as to whether he was justified in making the payments to continue his insurance in force, and I assume that will take some time for defendant's counsel to submit the question of a stipulation to the company's counsel and if that can be obviated by a stipulation I may be able to rest plaintiff's case at the next session. Otherwise I will have to produce my ancient parties, they are both in feeble health.

The Referee: Have you evidence of formal protest at the time of making the payments?

Mr. Bennett: No, I rely upon the construction of our contracts by the courts as matters of law, it having been expressly negatived by the opinions of courts of last resort to which I will call your Honor's attention later, that no power existed to change the amounts of the assessments unless by agreement of the parties. I will follow

104 that with proof, if the same is not stipulated, that after the decision of the courts on that point they sought to get the various parties to acquiesce in the larger assessments and in these specific instances they refused to acquiesce therein. That is already shown by the deposition but if it is necessary further we will have the printed blanks secured from the company's office.

Mr. Game: Since the depositions have been offered in the form that they have and the objections noted by the defendant the court necessarily can not make a ruling at this time.

The Referee: The referee reserves his decision with respect to the objections to the depositions and exceptions may then be taken to his ruling.

And thereupon the further taking of these depositions was adjourned until Monday, February 17, 1919, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

Morning Session, March 27, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this case was resumed pursuant to adjournment.

Present: Same parties by their counsel as at previous session.

And also GEORGE B. FREY, called on behalf of the plaintiffs, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Examined by Mr. Bennett:

Q. You are the same George D. Frey who has heretofore testified by deposition in this cause?

A. I am.

Q. You are acquainted with Robert Langdale of Loveland, Ohio?

A. Yes, sir.

105 Q. Did you call upon Mr. Langdale under authority from  
The Hartford Life Insurance Company relative to his certifi-

cate?

A. I did.

Q. I hand you here a paper marked for the purposes of identifica-  
Exhibit "C," and you may state to the referee what that is.

A. That is a letter from the vice president, Keeney.

Q. Vice president of what company?

A. Hartford Life Insurance Company, Hartford, Conn.

Q. Is he living?

A. As far as I know.

Mr. Bennett: The letter marked Exhibit "C" concerning which  
the witness has testified is as follows:

Mr. Game: The defendant objects on the ground that the letter  
is incompetent.

The Referee: The objection is overruled.

(Exception by the defendant.)

Mr. Bennett (reading):

"Hartford Life Insurance Company, Hartford, Conn.

Raymond G. Keeney, Vice President.

September 27, 1909.

M. George D. Frey,  
2106 Indianola Avenue,  
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR:

In case you meet certificate holders of this company who wish some  
evidence of your authorization to represent the Hartford Life Insur-  
ance Company in this special work which you are doing for us, you  
can show them this letter, and I will state further that any certificate  
holder can rely upon any statement or promise made by you the  
same as if made by one of the officers of the company.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND G. KEENEY,  
*Vice President.*"

Q. Under this letter of instructions state to the referee what you  
did in relation to Mr. Langdale, the plaintiff in this action.

06 A. I called on Mr. Langdale in regard to changing his cer-  
tificate and he objected.

Q. He objected to what?

A. To signing the slip in regard to changing his rate from \$2.68  
\$4.

Q. Was the slip presented to him by you?

A. It was.

Q. I will ask you if Exhibit "A" attached to the depositions in this cause is a copy of the slip mentioned by you.

A. It is.

Q. Give as near as you can, Mr. Frey, the time that you saw the plaintiff and presented the slip concerning which you have testified.

A. I cannot give the exact dates.

Q. Well, what time relative to the date of the letter which has been marked Exhibit "C"?

A. About that time, about the date of the letter.

Q. Now, do you recall the time of the decision in the case known as the Dresser case against the Hartford Life Insurance Company decided by the Supreme Court of Connecticut?

Mr. Game: The defendant objects on the ground that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.

The Referee: The referee thinks for the purpose of ascertaining approximately the date in question the inquiry is competent and the objection is overruled.

(Exception by the defendant.)

A. I have that date. I can furnish it. I recall that.

Q. State whether it was after the decision in that case that the Hartford Life Insurance Company sent you the slips heretofore marked Deposition Exhibit "A."

(Same objection by the defendant; objection overruled; exception by the defendant.)

107 A. It was during that trial.

Q. Had the Hartford Life Insurance Company before that time presented any slips to you or to the other agents of the company like that marked Deposition Exhibit "A" for certificate holders to execute?

(Same objection by defendant; overruled; exception by defendant.)

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Frey, state whether you saw Mr. Robert H. Langdale.

A. I did.

Q. What did you see him for?

A. In regard to signing that slip.

Q. Where did you see Mr. Langdale?

A. I met him at his office, Cincinnati.

Q. State whether it was relatively about the same time that you saw Mr. Douds.

A. To the best of my recollection it was about the same time.

Q. What was the business or profession of Robert H. Langdale?

A. Langdale was an attorney at law and he was administrator of that estate at this time. He was winding up the affairs of that estate.

- Q. State whether he is still living.  
A. He is.  
Q. At Loveland, Ohio?  
A. Near Loveland. Rural delivery is his address.  
Q. State what the conversation was that occurred between you and Mr. Langdale, if any.  
A. Well, Mr. Langdale would not sign and he took some time to deliberate over it, so I paid several visits to him.  
Q. Were you then making Cincinnati your headquarters?  
A. Cincinnati was my headquarters at that time.  
108 Q. Did you afterwards return to Mr. Langdale's office and see him relative to signing Deposition Exhibit "A"?  
A. I paid him some visits and he was absent on business; I did not get to see him. I do not just recollect the date of his return.  
Q. What was the conversation that occurred between you?  
A. It was in regard to the raising of his rates and he would not consent to it. That was about all we talked on, that line.  
Q. Well, what expression did he use or what conversation did you have with him relative to the increased assessment and his payment of the same?  
A. Well, he would pay it as long as he was able, he would have to pay it under protest as long as he was able to keep it up, to keep his insurance in force.  
Q. Did you afterwards make report to the Hartford Life Insurance Company of the results of your visits to these various certificate or policyholders?  
A. I did on my return to the home office.  
Q. What Home office?  
A. Hartford, Conn.  
Q. Did you go to Hartford, Conn.?  
A. Made a number of trips to Hartford.  
Q. To whom did you report?  
A. Mr. Keeney.  
Q. The vice president of the company?  
A. Vice president of the company and also the president.  
Q. Who was the president?  
A. George E. Keeney.  
Q. Which one was known as General Keeney?  
A. George E., the president.  
Q. State whether you had received a verbal authority or direction from General Keeney, the president, in addition to that contained in the letter of the vice president.  
109 Mr. Game: The defendant objects because it is already covered in the deposition and is repetition.  
(Objection overruled; exception by defendant.)  
A. I did.  
(And thereupon the defendant moved to strike out the above answer; motion overruled; exception by defendant.)

Q. I had not heretofore identified the two Keeneys. That is point. State generally, Mr. Frey, whether you saw all of the certificate holders or policyholders in the Hartford Life Insurance Company then residing in Ohio relative to this same slip marked Deposit Exhibit "A."

(Question objected to by the defendant as incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.)

A. I did.

Mr. Bennett: It is the extent of his authority. I want to show whether he executed the commission.

The Referee: The referee doubts the competency of the inquiry.

Mr. Bennett: I will withdraw it, so the question and answer may be stricken from the record.

Cross-examination.

By Mr. Game:

Q. Where do you live, Mr. Frey?

A. 2320 North Fourth street, Columbus, Ohio.

Q. When did you leave the employ of the Hartford Life Insurance Company?

A. About three years ago. I was with the Hartford Life and Missouri State Life, worked between the two.

110 Q. How often have you seen Robert Langdale since 1909?

A. I have seen him five or six times.

Q. Do you know how many assessments he has paid on his policy since 1909?

A. I know he paid up until he was unable to pay any further. He had a loss and fire and he lost nearly everything he had; that is what he went out on his farm; he is now residing on his farm near Loveland.

Q. How did Mr. Langdale pay his assessments?

A. Paid them to the company; they all paid to the company.

Q. None of his assessments were paid to you?

A. I had no authority to collect them. No agent had.

Q. Do you know whether or not Mr. Langdale made any protest at the time he made his various payments to the company?

A. Mr. Langdale—I can recollect the date—claimed that he would pay as long as he was able to pay. He would have to do that to keep his insurance in force and he would pay under protest.

Q. Is that what he said to you or is that the information he communicated to the home office of the company?

A. That is what he said to me.

Q. So you have no knowledge of any communication made by Mr. Langdale to the company by way of protest on account of the increased assessments?

A. I suppose the company records would show you.

Q. I asked you whether you had any knowledge.

A. I have none.

Redirect examination.

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. Mr. Frey, I do not know whether I have asked you the entire length of your employment by the Hartford Life Insurance Company and the various capacities in which you represented them; will you give that?

A. I represented them in '83.

Q. 1883.

A. Yes, when these contracts were issued.

Q. Go on and state the various capacities?

A. I was with them I guess between six and seven years.

Q. What capacity?

A. As general agent for Ohio, southern Ohio; and then I left and went east went back to Wisconsin; from the east went to Wisconsin. And when I returned to Ohio General Keeney went for me in regard to these certificates and he wanted me to see these policyholders and see what I could do in regard to having them sign that slip. I was with him about seven years on that, I think.

Q. Then the total length of your employment, the total time was how long?

A. Altogether about 15 years.

Q. Now, Mr. Frey, state whether Mr. Langdale had any knowledge of any change in the certificate or policies held by him prior to the time that you presented the slip marked Exhibit "A" to him for his signature.

(Question objected to by the defendant as incompetent; objection overruled; exception by the defendant.)

A. He did not.

Q. Do you know, Mr. Frey, whether or not you were the first person to communicate to Mr. Langdale that the terms of his policy had been changed?

(Question objected to by the defendant as to form; objection overruled; exception by defendant.)

A. I was the first.

Q. Give the facts, if you have the knowledge, Mr. Frey, as to the separation by The Hartford Life Insurance Company of its old line business from its mutual business.

(Question objected to by defendant as incompetent and immaterial; objection overruled; exception by the defendant.)

A. The old line business was absorbed by the Missouri State Life. They were consolidated, rather, when Mr. Hoyt bought out General Keeney's interest—John G. Hoyt.

(And thereupon the defendant moved to strike out the above answer; motion overruled; exception by the defendant.)

Q. What became of the mutual business; in what city was it transacted?

(Question objected to by the defendant; objection overruled; exception by the defendant.)

A. Hartford, Connecticut.

(And thereupon the defendant moved to strike out the above answer; motion overruled; exception by the defendant.)

A. St. Louis, Missouri.

(And thereupon the defendant moved to strike out the above answer; motion overruled; exception by the defendant.)

And thereupon the further hearing of this case was adjourned until Thursday, April 4, 1919, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

Morning Session, April 4, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this cause was adjourned until April 10, 1919, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

113

Morning Session, April 10, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this cause was adjourned until Thursday, April 24, 1919, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

Morning Session, April 24, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this cause was adjourned until Thursday, May 1, 1919, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

Morning Session, May 1, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this cause was resumed pursuant to adjournment.

Present: Same parties as at previous sessions.

Mr. Bennett: We haven't got in evidence, I believe, that he reached the age of seventy-four on February 26, 1914.

With these receipts covering the period that is covered in Frey's deposition, not desiring to encumber the record with numerous receipts, will you permit one of them to be introduced as representative of all of them between quarterly calls 100 and 140?

Mr. Game: Defendant has no objection.

Mr. Bennett: The plaintiff now offers a paper marked Exhibit D, otherwise designated as "Special Notice of Quarterly Call No. 100" by the defendant company, and it is agreed that Exhibit D may be taken as similar in all respects except as to dates and amounts down to and including consecutive calls to call 141 of February 26, 1914, at which time plaintiff ceased paying.



And thereupon the paper writing last above offered was admitted in evidence on behalf of the plaintiff, and is hereto attached, marked Exhibit D, and made a part hereof.

114 Mr. Bennett: Plaintiff further offers original receipts signed by the defendant company, from quarterly call No. 100 to 142, inclusive, but without making the same a part of the record.

And thereupon the plaintiff rested.

Mr. Game: The defendant now moves that upon the evidence already offered that judgment be entered in its favor as prayed for in its answer.

(And thereupon the referee overruled the above motion of the defendant, to which ruling the defendant excepted.)

And thereupon the defendant rested.

Mr. Game: Defendant now renews its motion for a judgment in its favor upon the evidence already offered, and moves that plaintiff's petition be dismissed.

(Motion overruled; exception by the defendant.)

And the foregoing was all the evidence offered, introduced and admitted on behalf of the plaintiff and on behalf of the defendant on this trial of this cause.

### Monday Morning Session, October 6, 1919.

And thereupon the further hearing of this matter was resumed.

Present: Same parties by their respective counsel as at previous sessions.

115 Mr. Bennett: Let the record show that the former entry showing that the plaintiff rests is set aside for the introduction of further testimony, and George D. Frey, who has heretofore been called and testified on behalf of the plaintiff, is recalled.

Mr. Game: To all of which the defendant objects and excepts.

GEORGE D. FREY, recalled as a witness on behalf of the plaintiff, testified as follows:

Examined by Mr. Bennett:

Q. Mr. Frey, you have heretofore testified orally in this case, haven't you?

A. I have.

Q. Also by deposition?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in your deposition have you set forth the computation of the amounts overpaid by the plaintiff on his contract?

A. I have.

Q. State whether at the time that you made the computation attached to your deposition you had and were familiar with the rule of the company in making such computation?

A. Yes, I had.

Q. Have you in your possession a report of the examination of the Safety Fund Department of the defendant company made by the Insurance Department of the state of Connecticut in 1906?

A. I have.

Q. Does such report contain a table showing the difference in the rates prior to 1885?

A. It does.

Q. Does it show the change of rates from 1885 to 1894?

A. It does.

Q. Does it show an entire new change of rates?

A. It does.

Q. After what year?

A. After 1884.

116 Q. 1894, you mean?

A. Yes, 1894.

For the purpose of identification I will have this marked Plaintiff's Exhibit E.

And thereupon the pamphlet marked "Report of an Examination of the Safety Fund Department of The Hartford Life Insurance Company by the Insurance Department of the State of Connecticut" was marked for the purposes of identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit E.

Q. Were you at the time of receiving this an agent of the defendant company?

A. At the time that was received?

Q. Yes.

A. No, I had served before and after.

Q. How long after this?

A. Very soon after that was received.

Q. The date?

A. That was received in 1906.

Q. The dates of your service in connection with the company have heretofore been given in your evidence, have they not?

A. I think they have; I am quite sure they have.

Q. You have heretofore given the conversations which you have had with the officers of the company concerning the change of rates, have you not?

A. I think so; as I recollect, I have.

Q. So as to advise the referee, if it has not heretofore been done, as to your method of making these computations, will you explain it by taking any one of the mortality calls?

A. I think I have the rule given by the secretary some place.

Q. Well, I am now asking about your method of computation. I hand you assessment number 111 on the policy of Mr. Langdale as typical of the others.

117 Mr. Bennett: Now, is that what the referee wanted to have brought out?

The Referee: More particularly the referee wanted whatever evidence the witness might have as to the mortality ratio actually used by the company.

Mr. Bennett: Yes.

The Referee: In his former testimony he gave it down to a certain point, but not down to the time of the death of the plaintiff Doud. The referee wanted any additional testimony, if he has it, as to the mortality ratios actually used by the company.

Mr. Bennett: Then my former question may be stricken out.

Q. In view of the request of the referee, I would ask if you have in the pamphlet referred to or otherwise the ratios used in the computation of the calls by the defendant company?

A. I have in this report.

Q. Just state the page of the report.

A. Pages 24 to 26.

Q. Down to what number of call is that extended?

A. Call 113.

Q. To what date?

A. To November 1st, 1906.

Q. Have you any further publication sent out by the company showing the ratios in addition to this shown on pages 24 to 26 of the exhibit referred to?

A. I have a slip here, issued by Secretary Lawrence, showing an additional call from 114 to 123, inclusive.

Q. Now, at the time you made the computation set forth in the exhibit attached to your deposition, did you follow the rule contained in these exhibits?

A. I did.

118 Q. I hand you a paper which, for purposes of identification, is marked Plaintiff's Exhibit F, and ask you what that is and where you received it.

And thereupon the card headed "The amount of each call in the Safety Fund Department is determined as follows," was marked for purposes of identification as Plaintiff's Exhibit F.

A. That is a copy sent out by Secretary Bacall in 1906.

Q. Did you resort to that in making the computation?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Bennett: I now offer in evidence the exhibit referred to as "Report of the examination of the Safety Fund Department" of the defendant company by the insurance department of the state of Connecticut in the following particulars:

The first nine pages thereof;

That portion thereof which is contained on pages 14 to 17, inclusive, under the heading, "The Safety Fund;" on page 14 and ending on page 17 with the subject "Administration of the Safety Trust Fund."

Also pages 24, 25 and 26, headed "Table D," on page 24, "List of Ratios," and ending with the words, "Women's divisions," on page 26.

Mr. Game: To the introduction of those parts of the exhibit just referred to by the plaintiff, the defendant objects upon the ground that they are incompetent, immaterial and irrelevant.

(And thereupon the referee overruled the above objection of the defendant, to which ruling of the referee the defendant excepted.)

119 And thereupon the portions of the exhibit above referred to were offered, introduced and admitted in evidence on behalf of the plaintiff, subject to the objection and exception of the defendant, and are in the words and figures following, to wit:

### EXHIBIT "E."

#### *Report of Examination.*

State of Connecticut.

Office of the Insurance Commissioner.

Hartford, November 8, 1906.

An examination of the condition and affairs of the Safety Fund Department of the Hartford Life Insurance Company, under the authority conferred by Sections 3490 and 3531 of the General Statutes, was begun by this Department in June of this year. The complete results are submitted herewith.

The objects of this examination were (1) to consider briefly the corporate history of the company and its legal powers and duties in relation to its assessment business; (2) to describe and analyze the various kinds of Safety Fund or assessment policies in force and to ascertain whether the terms of these contracts had been rigorously complied with; (3) to investigate the mortality experienced by the company on its assessment policies; (4) to investigate the history of the administration of the Safety Fund by the trustee thereof since beginning in 1880; (5) to verify the financial statement of the Safety Fund Department made to the Insurance Commissioner for the year ended December 31, 1905; and (6) to consider generally such of the methods of business pursued in the company's Safety Fund Department as might seem advisable.

120 For the fourth purpose above mentioned, the Security Company, as trustee of the Safety Fund, placed its books and records at the command of the department examiners. All ledger entries pertaining to the Safety Fund, for the twenty-five years since its beginning, were abstracted and summarized.

In making this examination the department has had the assistance and advice of Mr. Clayton C. Hall, of Baltimore, Maryland, an actuary of over thirty-five years' experience in the active practice of the profession. Mr. Hall's report follows on page 3.

On page 28 will be found a supplementary report summarizing the results of an examination of the company's books and vouchers by a clerical force from this department.

This examination did not include the stock department of the company, which is doing a legal reserve business exclusively.

THERON UPSON,  
*Insurance Commissioner*

*Report of Clayton C. Hall, Consulting Actuary.*

Baltimore, Md., October 29, 1906.

Hon. Theron Upson,  
Insurance Commissioner,  
Hartford, Conn.

SIR:

In compliance with your request I have taken part in the examination of the Safety Fund Department of the Hartford Life Insurance Company begun in June last, under your direction, by the examiners of your office, and recently completed.

121 The financial condition of the department of the company's business, together with the statement of receipts and disbursements for the year 1905, are fully shown in the statements which have been prepared for that purpose.

I respectfully submit the following report upon the subjects which were particularly referred to me for consideration. In order that a clear view of the subject may be presented, it is necessary to review briefly the corporate history of the company, the terms of the trust agreement under which the Safety Fund was established; the manner in which the fund has been administered, and the conditions contained in the policies or certificates of membership issued by the company to persons insured in the Safety Fund Department.

**Corporate History.**

The company was originally created under the name of the Hartford Accident Insurance Company, by resolution of the assembly at its session in 1866. Its charter was subsequently amended by resolutions adopted at sessions of 1867, 1868, 1879, 1882, 1897 and 1903, enlarging the powers of the corporation and changing its title successively to "Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company," "Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company," and finally to "The Hartford Life Insurance Company," the name by which the corporation is now known and under which its business is conducted.

The only enactment amendatory to the charter of the company which it is necessary here to cite is Section 6 of the amendment approved May 22, 1867, which was amended by resolution approved April 25, 1882, to read as follows:

122 "Section 6. It shall be the duty of said company to reserve out of its receipts an amount sufficient to reinsure all its outstanding life

risks of whatever description other than mere accident risks and other than such contracts as it has made or may make wherein the sum payable upon the death of the person named in any such contract is made contingent upon an assessment collected from the associated holders of such contracts, said amount to be computed upon an assumption of mortality of the rates, known as the actuaries' or combined experience rates, and at a rate of interest of four per cent per annum; and such reserve shall be exempt from any liability for losses or claims arising from any general accident policy or contract insuring against death or disability caused by accident, and no dividend or interest shall be paid to either stockholders or policyholders by which payment said reserve would be reduced below the minimum amount required by the provisions hereof; provided, that the capital stock of the company shall be liable for all its contracts without exemption by reason of anything therein contained."

### The Safety Fund System.

The theory of the Safety Fund System, which is unlike the plan upon which the business of all the other life insurance companies in Connecticut is conducted and in fact unlike that of any insurance company now in existence, can best be stated by quoting from the official publication of the company by which it was introduced.

In a "Manual" or "Agents' Hand Book" issued by the  
123 Hartford Life and Annuity Company, and bearing the date 1893, the following words appear on page 13:

"In 1880 it (the company) adopted its popular and well known Safety Fund System of Insurance, which has been and is now so popular.

"The Safety Fund System of life insurance differs essentially from any other plan operated, either by company or association. It is a plan of pure insurance, avoiding the accumulation of a reserve fund beyond the point of necessity for absolute security to the policyholders, the only investment feature being that of the single payment of \$10.00 for each \$1,000.00 of insurance, made but once, to form the Safety Fund, which is held in trust for a specific emergency, and for the sale benefit of the policyholders."

### Trust Agreement.

For the purpose of carrying into effect this Safety Fund System, an agreement was entered into between the Insurance Company and the Security Company of (Hartford, Connecticut), by which the latter became the trustee of the fund.

The essential features of the trust agreement, which is dated December 31, 1879, are contained in the following paragraphs which are quoted therefrom:

"Whereas, the party of the first part purposes to issue to persons contracting therefor, certificates of membership in a special depart-

ment of its business to be known as the Safety Fund Department, and, in consideration of the sum of ten dollars to be received  
124 on each one thousand dollars of the amount of each and every such certificate for the purpose of creating a Safety Fund, to insert therein sundry agreements with such persons in the following words, to wit:

"That said company will deposit said sum of ten dollars, when received, with the trustee, named in a contract made with it (of which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust for the uses and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall at the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety Fund shall then amount to three hundred thousand dollars, or whenever thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-annual division of the net interest received therefrom by it, pro rata among all the holders of certificates in force in said department at such times, who shall have contributed five years prior to the date of any such division their stipulated proportion of said fund, by applying the same to the payment of their future dues and assessments; and that, whenever said fund shall amount to one million dollars, all subsequent receipts therefor shall be divided by the said company in like manner as the interest.

"Said company further agrees that if at any time, after said fund shall have amounted to three hundred thousand dollars, or after five years from January 1, 1880, if that amount shall not have been attained before that date, it shall fail by reason of insufficient membership or shall neglect if justly and legally due, to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any certificate issued  
125 in said department, and such certificate shall be presented for payment to said trustee by the legal holder thereof, accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as hereinafter provided, of its failure to pay, after demand upon it within the time herein stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be the duty of said trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and divide the same (less the reasonable charges and expense for the management and control of said fund) among all the holders of certificates then in force in said department, or their legal representatives, in the proportion which the amount of each of their certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole number of such certificates in force; and that in such event it shall file with said trustee a correct list, under oath, of the names, residences, and amounts of the certificates of all members entitled to participate in such division. The evidence referred to above to be either certification by said insurance company's president or secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for the period of sixty days from its date."

Among the obligations assumed by the Security Company, trustee, are the following:



"That, as often as the sums composing such fund shall be in amount sufficient to purchase one thousand dollars, par value, of United States bonds, said trustee shall make investment of such funds therein and register the same in its name as trustee of the Safety Fund of the said insurance company, and provided no default by the party of the first part as hereinbefore recited shall  
 126 occur, shall accumulate said fund and the income thereof (less the reasonable compensation and expenses), for five years from July 1, 1879, or until such time thereafter as said fund shall amount to three hundred thousand dollars, par value, of the bonds purchased for said fund, when the party of the second part will pay over to the party of the first part, semi-annually thereafter, all the further income from said fund (less the accruing and unpaid compensation and expenses) to be by the party of the first part used for the purposes mentioned in the hereinbefore recited agreements; and, unless such default shall occur, will thereafter add to the principal of said fund the deposits thereafter received from the party of the first part, exclusive of the income therefrom, until the whole fund shall amount in such bonds, at their par value, to one million dollars. And in the event of the failure or neglect mentioned in the hereinbefore recited agreements, will convert said fund into money and divide the same in accordance with the hereinbefore recited agreements, as soon as can reasonably be done after the necessary information of the proper persons and their shares shall have been obtained. Said party of the first part hereby agreeing to put the party of the second part in possession of the information required for the making of a proper division thereof as agreed with its certificate holders."

"It is hereby mutually understood and agreed by both parties hereto that all the hereinbefore cited agreements of the party of the first part with its certificate holders shall constitute the uses  
 127 and purpose of the trust expressed herein. And it is hereby further understood and agreed that at such time as it shall be shown that all certificates of membership issued by the party of the first part in its Safety Fund Department, have been legally settled and surrendered to it, or properly canceled in accordance with their terms, it shall be held and considered that the uses and purposes of said trust have been fully accomplished by said insurance company, and the balance of said fund, if any, shall be paid over to the party of the first part."

In 1889 an act was passed by the General Assembly in relation to the investments of this fund as follows:

"Resolved, by this assembly, that the Security Company, a corporation located in Hartford, be and it is hereby authorized to invest the funds known as the Safety Funds, which it now holds or may hereafter receive from the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, a corporation also located in said Hartford, under a contract between said companies, dated the thirty-first day of December, 1879, in trust for the benefit and security of certain holders



of certificates of membership in said Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, in such other securities, in addition to United States bonds, as the life insurance companies of this state are authorized to invest in, instead of being compelled to invest all said funds in United States bonds as specified in said contract; provided, such investments of said funds in other securities than United States bonds shall be made with the consent and approval of said Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company; and, provided further, that  
 128 nothing in this resolution shall be construed as in any way to vary, alter, or change the purposes, conditions or stipulations of such trust as set forth in said contract, except as to the kind of securities in which the same may be invested."

### Policy Contracts.

The policies issued in the Safety Fund Department differ widely in form.

The old "certificates of membership," in use in 1880 and afterwards, contained a provision as follows:

"An assessment for as many dollars as there shall be similar certificates in force in said department at the date of such death shall be made upon the holders thereof according to the table of graduated assessment rates, given hereon, as determined by their respective ages when assessed, and the sum collected thereon \* \* \* shall be paid to —, \* \* \* Provided, however, that in no case shall the payment upon this certificate in the event of such death exceed one thousand dollars."

Beneath the "Table of Graduated Assessment Rates" given on the back of the certificate is printed the following:

"These rates will decrease as the certificates in force increase above one thousand in number."

It is said by the present officers of the company that these statements were based upon an hypothesis that a separate assessment would be levied for each death.

From about 1885 to 1894 it seems to have been provided in all policies that the assessments paid should form a mortuary fund, and that the "indemnity" should be payable from that fund only.

129 Under contracts so worded the liability of the company is evidently limited by the sufficiency of the mortuary fund, so formed, and extends no further.

In the forms of policy contract adopted in 1894, and all in use since that year, the amount of the indemnity has been expressed as a definite sum and a direct liability of the company. The liability of the policyholder to pay such mortality contributions as may be levied in the manner prescribed in the policy, is distinctly expressed, but it is nowhere stated that the liability of the company is limited by the results of such levies or assessments or the sufficiency of any mortuary fund. No such fund is mentioned.

## Change of Rates.

Upon most of the forms of policy issued in the Safety Fund Department, but not all, there is printed a "table of rates" by which assessments for the mortality fund or for mortuary claims, are to be levied according to the attained age of the policyholder. In the year 1894, it having been recognized that the rates previously in force did not fairly represent the distribution of mortality actually experienced by the company at the several ages of life, a new table of rates was adopted as the basis of assessment for all policies issued from and after the date of its adoption.

130 The old rates and those adopted in 1894 are as follows:

Ages.	Old rate.	New rate.
15-21 .....	\$0.65	\$0.74
22 .....	.69	.76
23 .....	.71	.77
24 .....	.73	.78
25 .....	.75	.79
26 .....	.77	.80
27 .....	.79	.81
28 .....	.81	.83
29 .....	.83	.84
30 .....	.85	.86
31 .....	.88	.87
32 .....	.91	.89
33 .....	.94	.91
34 .....	.97	.93
35 .....	1.00	.95
36 .....	1.03	.97
37 .....	1.06	.99
38 .....	1.09	1.01
39 .....	1.12	1.04
40 .....	1.14	1.06
41 .....	1.16	1.09
42 .....	1.18	1.13
43 .....	1.20	1.17
44 .....	1.22	1.21
45 .....	1.25	1.25
46 .....	1.30	1.30
47 .....	1.35	1.40
48 .....	1.40	1.50
49 .....		
131		
50 .....	1.47	1.50
51 .....	1.54	1.60
52 .....	1.63	1.70
53 .....	1.72	1.80
54 .....	1.81	2.00
55 .....	1.92	2.10

Ages.	Old rate.	New rate.
56 .....	2.03	2.31
57 .....	2.15	2.47
58 .....	2.32	2.64
59 .....	2.50	3.03
60 .....	2.68	3.47
61 .....	2.86	3.94
62 .....	3.08	4.43
63 .....	3.30	4.96
64 .....	3.65	5.56
65 .....	4.00	6.24

It is to be observed that the changes made, in this effort to adjust the rates more nearly to actual experience, were quite radical. From ages 15 to 31 the new rates are higher than the old; from ages 32 to 45 they are lower; while from age 46 and over the new rates are not only higher than the old, but the increase from year to year is rapid, until for age 65 and over the new rate of assessment is \$6.24 as compared with \$4.00 under the old, or an advance of more than 50 per cent upon the "rating" under the latter.

The method of assessment under these policies is expressed in the conditions printed thereon as follows:

"On the first day of March, June, September and December in every calendar year, after date hereof, there shall be due and payable (less such semi-annual distributions as shall be made hereon of the interest and surplus from the said Safety Fund) such mortality contributions as shall be levied and called hereon upon the rating of this policy in column 1 of the table of mortality rates printed hereon at the then respective age of the member, according to the ratio which the total like rating of all policies in the same department (after making due allowance for lapses) shall bear to the aggregate matured indemnity fixed upon by the company to be met," etc.

This language would seem to require that the "ratio" so-called should be applied to a uniform "rating" for all members of the same department; but as to the ratios in fact applied to the "rating" printed on the policy it is evident that the actual contributions levied upon persons holding policies issued in 1894 and subsequent years differ materially from the assessments upon persons of the same age holding policies of earlier issues. But any readjustment of the method of levying the assessments so as to make them uniform, even if desirable, would apparently be inconsistent with the terms of the contracts, and impracticable.

The terms "rate," "ratings," and "ratios" have been used in different senses in different policy forms issued by the company; but the meaning now attached to the several terms, and the manner in which the amounts of assessments are determined are explained by the company in a circular of which the following is a copy:

"The amount of each call in the Safety Fund Department is determined as follows:

133 By an accurate calculation, the exact amount which will be produced by the assessment of one rate, as published on the back of the certificate at the attained age of each member whose certificate is in force, is ascertained. This sum is then divided into the whole amount of death claims which have accrued in the quarter and the quotient is the factor which we call the ratio. The ratio is the number of times the rate which it is necessary for each member to pay in order to make up the full sum of death claims approved due allowance being made for lapses. The rate increases with advancing age each year up to age 65. Beyond that age the increase is caused wholly by an increase of the ratio."

### The Safety Fund.

This fund was created, as the quotations from the agreement with the trustee and the conditions contained in the policies show, by contributions from the policyholders of \$10.00 for each \$1,000 of insurance.

In the manual already quoted it is stated (page 13) that the fund is held in trust "for the sole benefit of the policyholders."

And again on page 15, that

"\* \* \* it is provided in the system and its contracts that should the amount of insurance fall below one million the trustees of the fund shall, upon proper notification, divide the fund among the remaining policyholders, changing the whole life policies to mature endowments, to meet the full face value of which the fund would be ample."

No such agreement is to be found either in the trust agreement or the policy-contracts.

134 It is provided, however, that in the event of the refusal or failure of the company

"\* \* \* to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any certificate issued in said department and such certificate shall be presented for payment to said trustee by the legal holder thereof \* \* \* it shall be the duty of said trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and divide the same (less reasonable charges and expenses for the management and control of said fund, among all the holders of certificates then in force in said department)."

The evidence required of default having been committed by the company is either a certificate from its president or secretary that the claim is justly and legally due and that payment has been demanded and refused (which would be practically equivalent to a confession of insolvency) or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction.

In the conditions printed on the policies it is stated that

"\* \* \* this policy or certificate of membership is issued in a special department known as the Safety Fund Department and participates in all the benefits of the trustee's contract which is printed hereon and referred to and made a part hereof with the same effect as if recited in full in this condition. And if any final distribution of said safety fund shall be ordered as provided for therein, said distribution shall be in lieu of payment hereunder and all liability of the company shall cease in respect of this contract."

135 The amount of the Safety Fund (men's division) is about \$1,000,000.00. The amount of insurance outstanding in the department is reported to be about \$40,000,000.00 so that if a distribution of the fund were ordered and made there would be a dividend of about \$25.00 upon each \$1,000.00 of insurance, and the holders of matured claims would in this event be treated precisely like the holders of running policies.

If the liability of the company upon these policies is in fact limited to the amount of the Safety Fund, and the obtaining of a judgment would result in the distribution of the fund, giving the holder in effect merely a right to receive his distributive share in the Safety Fund, then a judgment of \$1,000.00 would at this time be satisfied by the payment of \$25.00 and the business of the department would be terminated and its policies canceled. But it has already been pointed out that while policies which are to be paid out of a particular "mortuary fund" only, are obviously limited by the sufficiency of that fund, the greater number of the policies issued in the Safety Fund Department contain no such limitation.

The amendment to the company's charter, made April 25, 1882, requires the maintenance of a regular reserve upon all life policies other than mere accident risks, and contracts on which the sum payable "is made contingent upon an assessment collected." And it further provides "that the capital stock of the company shall be liable for all its contracts without exception by reason of anything herein contained."

The policies issued in the Safety Fund Department do provide for assessments regulated according to the attained age and therefore, according to the theory of assessment insurance, the value of the future unpaid premiums would at all times be equal to and fully offset the value of the insurance outstanding. But the payment of the indemnity is not made contingent upon the collection of any assessment, except in those cases where they are payable out of a "Mortuary Fund" only. Otherwise they are unequalled obligations of the company. These contracts are to be distinguished from those of the Massachusetts Safety Fund Association (147 Mass. 363, 367), where the obligation assumed was not to pay an indemnity, but to levy an assessment for the purpose.

136 The sum of ten dollars for each one thousand dollars of insurance required to be paid for the creation of the Safety Fund was in no sense an assessment. It was a stipulated sum in consideration of which the policyholders became entitled to, as recited in the policies, participation in all benefits of the trustee's contract."

These benefits consist, so far as the policyholders are concerned, in a distributive share in the interest on the invested fund, and after the sum of \$1,000,000.00 had been obtained, in the distribution of the contributions which the new members might make toward its creation. As the company ceased issuing policies upon the assessment plan in 1899 no new contributions (except some deferred installments on old policies) come in, and the interest revenue is about \$40,000.00 or 4 per cent upon the principal yearly, admitting of a dividend of about \$1.00 on each \$1,000.00 of insurance.

It is distinctly provided in the trust agreement that after all certificates issued in the Safety Fund Department "have been  
137 legally settled and surrendered to it or properly canceled  
\* \* \* the balance of said fund, if any, shall be paid over to the \* \* \*" company. That is to say, according to the letter of the trust agreement embodied in the policy contracts, the policyholders have no interest in or title to the corpus of the fund except in the event of its distribution as already described. Otherwise it inures wholly to the stockholders.

As to the causes which led to the discontinuance by the company in 1899 of issuing new policies in the Safety Fund Department, it is claimed by the company that on account of the general distrust of the assessment plan which had arisen, and consequent restrictive legislation, its further conduct had become impossible. At a hearing before the insurance committee of the legislature in April, 1905 it was stated by the counsel for the company, that "they stopped because legislation in the different states was hostile."

At the same hearing the president of the company said:

"Regardless of the facts, the gentlemen say the company could go on. I say they could not \* \* \*. All we could get were practically people who worked in shops among whom the mortality is very much higher. It meant the mortality would have gone so high it would have wrecked us."

In a circular issued to certificate holders under date of May 22, 1906, and bearing the signatures of both Hon. George E. Keeney, then president, and Mr. Charles H. Bacall, the secretary, it is stated as follows:

"The company was forced to discontinue the issue of Safety Fund certificates because of the revulsion of public sentiment against assessment insurance, and the consequent hostile legislation."

138

## TABLE D.

*List of Ratios in the Calls of the Safety Fund Department of the Hartford Life Insurance Company, Beginning June 10, 1888, This Assessment Being Designated as No. 4.*

The first three assessments were made in the Mutual Benefit Association. In every case the ratio given is that levied upon the gross body of the members. In every assessment up to the discontin-

ance of the issue of Safety Fund Certificates this ratio was modified in the case of those members who had not been in the company a full year.

## Men's Division.

Call No.	Ratio.	Date issued.
4.....	\$0.81	June 10, 1880.
5.....	1.12	September 6, 1880.
6.....	1.34	November 20, 1880.
7.....	1.15	February 1, 1881.
8.....	1.81	March 29, 1880.
9.....	1.50	June 3, 1881.
10.....	1.45	September 20, 1881.
11.....	1.60	November 5, 1881.
12.....	1.60	January 11, 1882.
13.....	1.70	March 20, 1882.
14.....	1.65	June 17, 1882.
15.....	1.36	September 7, 1882.
16.....	1.22	November 27, 1882.
17.....	1.70	February 10, 1883.
18.....	1.65	April 25, 1883.
19.....	1.55	July 17, 1883.
20.....	1.36	September 29, 1883.
139		
21.....	1.23	November 27, 1883.
22.....	1.65	February 1, 1884.
23.....	1.55	May 1, 1884.
24.....	1.40	August 1, 1884.
25.....	1.65	November 1, 1884.
26.....	1.65	February 1, 1885.
27.....	1.72	May 1, 1885.
28.....	2.05	August 1, 1885.
29.....	2.03	November 1, 1885.
30.....	2.05	February 1, 1886.
31.....	2.03	May 1, 1886.
32.....	2.15	August 1, 1886.
33.....	2.10	November 1, 1886.
34.....	2.10	February 1, 1887.
35.....	2.10	May 1, 1887.
36.....	2.10	August 1, 1887.
37.....	2.10	November 1, 1887.
38.....	2.10	February 1, 1888.
39.....	2.10	May 1, 1888.
40.....	2.10	August 1, 1888.
41.....	2.10	November 1, 1888.
42.....	2.10	February 1, 1889.
43.....	2.10	May 1, 1889.
44.....	2.10	August 1, 1889.
45.....	2.10	November 1, 1889.

Call No.	Ratio.	Date issued.
46.....	2.10	February 1, 1890.
47.....	2.10	May 1, 1890.
48.....	2.10	August 2, 1890.
49.....	2.52	November 1, 1890.
50.....	2.40	February 1, 1891.
140		
51.....	2.25	May 1, 1891.
52.....	2.25	August 1, 1891.
53.....	2.20	November 1, 1891.
54.....	2.20	February 1, 1892.
55.....	2.20	May 1, 1892.
56.....	2.20	August 1, 1892.
57.....	3.30	November 1, 1892.
58.....	2.20	February 1, 1893.
59.....	2.20	May 1, 1893.
60.....	2.20	August 2, 1893.
61.....	2.20	November 1, 1893.
62.....	2.25	February 1, 1894.
63.....	2.25	May 1, 1894.
64.....	2.25	August 1, 1894.
65.....	2.25	November 1, 1894.
66.....	2.25	February 1, 1895.
67.....	2.61	May 1, 1895.
68.....	2.40	August 1, 1895.
69.....	2.40	November 1, 1895.
70.....	2.40	February 1, 1896.
71.....	2.40	May 1, 1896.
72.....	2.40	August 1, 1896.
73.....	2.40	November 1, 1896.
74.....	2.40	February 1, 1897.
75.....	2.40	May 1, 1897.
76.....	2.40	August 1, 1897.
77.....	2.40	November 1, 1897.
78.....	2.50	January 30, 1898.
79.....	3.00	May 2, 1898.
80.....	3.00	August 2, 1898.
141		
81.....	3.00	November 1, 1898.
82.....	3.00	February 1, 1899.
83.....	3.00	May 1, 1899.
84.....	3.00	August 2, 1899.
85.....	3.00	November 1, 1899.
86.....	3.00	January 30, 1900.
87.....	3.00	May 2, 1900.
88.....	3.25	August 2, 1900.
89.....	3.25	November 1, 1900.
90.....	3.25	January 30, 1901.



Call No.	Ratio.	Date issued.
91.....	3.25	May 2, 1900.
92.....	3.60	August 2, 1901.
93.....	3.35	November 1, 1901.
94.....	3.80	January 30, 1902.
95.....	3.80	May 2, 1902.
96.....	3.75	August 2, 1902.
97.....	3.25	November 1, 1902.
98.....	3.25	February 1, 1903.
99.....	3.25	May 2, 1903.
100.....	3.25	August 2, 1903.
101.....	3.80	November 1, 1903.
102.....	3.30	February 1, 1904.
103.....	3.80	May 2, 1904.
104.....	3.80	August 2, 1904.
105.....	3.60	November 1, 1904.
106.....	3.60	February 1, 1905.
107.....	3.80	May 2, 1905.
108.....	3.60	August 2, 1905.
109.....	3.80	November 1, 1905.
110.....	3.80	February 1, 1906.
111.....	3.50	May 1, 1906.
112.....	3.75	August 1, 1906.
113.....	3.20	November 1, 1906.

142 Mr. Bennett: Plaintiff next offers the continuation of the calls and ratios as shown by Plaintiff's Exhibit F, being from call 113 to 123, inclusive.

Mr. Game: To the introduction of which the defendant objects upon the grounds that it is incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial.

(And thereupon the referee overruled the above objection of the defendant, to which ruling of the referee the defendant excepted.)

And thereupon the portion of the exhibit above offered was introduced and admitted in evidence on behalf of the plaintiff, subject to the objection and exception of the defendant, and is in the words and figures following, to wit:

"The amount of each call in the Safety Fund Department is determined as follows:

By an accurate calculation, the exact amount which will be produced by the assessment of one rate, as illustrated in the table of graduated assessment rates on the back of the certificate, at the attained age of each member whose certificate is in force, is ascertained. This sum is then divided into the whole amount of death claims which have accrued in the quarter, and the quotient is the factor which we call the ratio. The ratio is the number of times the rate which it is necessary for each member to pay in order to make up the full sum of death claims approved, due allowance being made for lapses. The rate increases with advancing age each year up to

the age of 65. Beyond that age the rate for the age does not increase, and any variation in the assessment is due to a variation in mortality.

T. F. LAWRENCE,  
*Secretary.*

143

Call No.	Date.	Ratio.
113.	Nov., 1906.....	\$3.20
114.	Feb., 1907.....	3.50
115.	May, 1907.....	3.55
116.	Aug., 1907.....	3.20
117.	Nov., 1907.....	3.00
118.	Feb., 1908.....	3.20
119.	May, 1908.....	3.80
120.	Aug., 1908.....	3.60
121.	Nov., 1908.....	3.30
122.	Feb., 1909.....	3.80
123.	May, 1909.....	3.80

Mr. Bennett: Now, I have not got that down to the date of the last assessment in the Doud case, that is, by any of the exhibits sent out by the company, but I have covered that by the witness having pursued the same method of computation with kindred ratios arrived at by the same rule in making the computations that have been brought down to the date of the last assessment in the Doud case, and to the date of the last assessment preceding the bringing of the suit in the Langdale case.

Mr. Bennett: I now desire to offer in evidence plaintiff's Exhibit G, heretofore identified by the witness, Frey, in the language following:

You can always satisfy yourself that you are assessed in accordance with your policy contract. If you will bear in mind that the rate at age 60 is \$2.68, dividing this rate into the amount of your assessment will give you the ratio or number of times the rate. The ratio in the current call is 3 50/100. Multiplying this by \$2.68 we have \$9.38 as the assessment on \$1,000.00; \$93.80 the assessment on \$10,000.00.

Which, as made applicable to the amounts of the policies in the cases at bar, would be \$3,000.00 each.

Q. Now, Mr. Frey, in asking you a question a while ago as to whether you followed a certain rule, I will ask you again, having heard this rule read into the record by counsel for plaintiff, to state to the referee whether you followed that in making the——

A. That is the only rule I had from the company.

Q. In making the computation attached to your deposition as Exhibit B?

A. That is the only one I had to follow.

Q. And you did follow it?

A. Yes.

Mr. Bennett: I will ask him one more question.

Q. Will you be able to take the same rule and add to Exhibit B, being your computations, the amounts of the additional calls down to the last one paid by Doctor Doud prior to his death and the last one paid by Mr. Langdale prior to the commencement of this action?

A. Applied to all of them.

The Referee: I do not think he understood the question yet.

Q. The question is, in the Doud case your computation only extended to call 152, being made in September, 1916?

A. In the Doud case 161.

Q. This is the Doud case—152. Can you make the additional computation under similar rule under which you have computed this of the additional calls down to the last call paid by Doctor Doud?

A. Yes, sir.

145 Q. For that purpose will it be necessary for you to have the calls before you?

A. No. It will be necessary to have the calls before me in computing the ratio—that is, the quarterly call issued by the company.

The Referee: I suppose he meant yes.

Mr. Bennett: I will undertake to get you the additional calls so that these computations may be made, if accepted by the referee.

Q. Now, in the exhibit attached to your deposition in the Langdale case, you have made computations of the amounts down to quarterly call 142, being in the month of March, 1914. I will ask you whether you can extend the computations under similar rule down to the last call prior to the commencement of this action?

A. I can.

Q. Referring to the Langdale action. I will request you, therefore, to consider yourself under oath and make the computations required and hand them to the referee.

A. Yes.

Mr. Bennett: Do you want to object?

Mr. Game: No, I think not. You are usurping the function of the referee, probably.

The Referee: The referee assumes that the witness has no information in the form of data from the company showing the ratios that were actually used after call 123, May, 1909, but that the ratios which he proposes to furnish after that date are matters of computation.

Mr. Game: Just a minute. If that is the understanding, then the defendant objects, because there is no evidence what the ratios are. I assumed you had the ratios here and were going to make the computation.

146 Q. Adopting the inquiry of the referee heretofore made, I will ask you if you can make the computations showing the ratios under the rule adopted by the company, so as to show to the referee the ratio as well as the amount?

A. I can show the ratio to the amount of the quarterly call. I can show you the figures—the way the company got at it, by taking the

number of deaths, the amount of insurance in force, what it would be necessary to call on these members to make up this quarterly call, and then multiplying this ratio by the rate would give you the amount necessary, collecting the amount of the quarterly call. That gives you the ratio for the mortality, only the dues are fixed and that leaves that out.

Q. It leaves out of account the amount of the dues?

A. Yes.

Q. I will ask you then, for that purpose, is it necessary to have anything else than the quarterly calls that have been given to these members?

A. That is all, to strike the ratio that the company used.

The Referee: From that you can compute the number of deaths?

The Witness: No, you cannot, but they show the number of deaths on their call list.

Mr. Bennett: On each quarterly call. Will you have that read, "On each quarterly call?"

The Witness: Each quarterly call.

Mr. Bennett: Now, I wanted to give to the counsel and to the referee my idea before, why I did not introduce these separate calls. They would be cumbersome. But I did show that he used the calls to make the computations, and now we have reiterated that.  
147 but should you insist that each call go in, of course, that would be cumbersome. But here is the result of it and the method arrived at.

The Referee: In order that the case may be entirely before the referee, it seems to me that the calls subsequent to number 123 should be in evidence.

The Referee: Let the record show that it is stipulated that the witness use the calls without their being formally introduced in evidence.

Mr. Game: He may make a tabular record of the calls, without offering the calls themselves.

The Referee: Subsequent to call number 123.

The Witness: On some, but not all, of these we have the call; not all, but it will apply because they are all the same age.

Mr. Bennett: Let the results of his computations be handed to the referee.

Mr. Game: I have no objection to handing them to the referee, but I could not, of course, accept his computations. I have no objection to his tabular work, but I do not think his computations should be made a part of the record.

Mr. Bennett: I understand the proposition to be that Mr. Frey will be permitted to make a chronological arrangement in tabular form of the calls in the same form as it has heretofore been made, attached as exhibits to his depositions, and that they shall be extended down to the respective dates heretofore referred to, namely, in

148 the Doud case, to the date of the last call paid by Doctor Doud, the plaintiff, and in the Langdale case according to the date set forth in the petition.

No cross-examination.

And thereupon the plaintiff rested.

Mr. Game: The defendant now renews its motion for a judgment in its favor upon the evidence already offered, and moves that the plaintiff's petition be dismissed.

And thereupon the referee overruled the above motion of the defendant, to which ruling of the referee the defendant excepted.

And thereupon the defendant rested.

And thereupon the defendant renewed its motion for a judgment in its favor upon the evidence already offered, and to dismiss the plaintiff's petition; motion overruled; exception by the defendant.

And the foregoing is all of the evidence offered, introduced and admitted on behalf of the plaintiff and on behalf of the defendant in this trial of this cause.

#### "EXHIBIT A."

##### *Certificate of Membership.*

Benefit Not to Exceed \$3,000.

No. 30031.

Safety Fund Department.

Age 40.

The

Hartford Life and Annuity Ins. Co.

of Hartford, Connecticut,

in consideration of the representations, agreements and warranties made by the applicant in the application herefor, and of the Admission Fee paid; and of the sum of Ten Dollars, to be paid to said Company, on each \$1,000 of the maximum indemnity herein provided for, to create a Safety Fund, as hereinafter described, and of Ten Dollars per annum on each \$1,000, for expenses, to be paid hereinafter conditioned and of the further payment, in accordance with the conditions hereof, of all Mortuary Assessments, does hereby issue this Certificate of Membership in its Safety Fund Department to Robert H. Langdale of Terrace Park, county of Hamilton, State of Ohio, with the following agreements: That said Company will deposit said sum of Ten Dollars, when received, with the Trustee, named in a contract made with it (of which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust for the said and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall at the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety Fund shall not amount to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, or whenever thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-annual division of the net interest received therefrom by it, pro rata among all the holders of Certificates in force in said Department at such times, who

shall have contributed, five years prior to the date of any such division their stipulated proportion of said Fund, be applying the same to the payment of their future dues and assessments; and that, whenever said Fund shall amount to One Million Dollars all subsequent receipts therefor shall be divided by the said Company in like manner as the interest. Said Company further agrees that if at any time, after said Fund shall have amounted to Three Hundred Thousand

Dollars, or after five years from January 1, 1880, if that  
150 amount shall not have been attained before that date, it shall fail by reason of insufficient membership, or, shall neglect if justly and legally due, to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the terms of any Certificate issued in said Department and such Certificate shall be presented for payment to said Trustee by the legal holder thereof, accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as hereinafter provided, of its failure to pay, after demand upon it within the time herein stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be the duty of said Trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into money and divide the same (less the reasonable charges and expenses for the management and control of said Fund) among all the holders of Certificates then in force in said Department, or their legal representatives, in the proportion which the amount of each of their Certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole number of such Certificates in force; and that in such event it shall file with said Trustee a correct list under oath, of the names, residences and amounts of the Certificates of all members entitled to participate in such division. The evidence referred to above to be either certification by said Insurance Company's President or Secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for the period of sixty days from this date. And said Company further agrees that  
151 so long as any Certificate of Membership in the Safety Fund Department shall remain in force, said Fund shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose except as above mentioned.

Upon the death of the member aforesaid while this Certificate is in force, all the conditions hereof having been conformed to by said member, and on the receipt by the President or Secretary of said Company of satisfactory proofs of such death, an assessment shall be made upon the holders of all Certificates in force in said Department at the date of such death, according to the table of graduated assessment rates, given hereon, as determined by their respective ages and the number of such Certificates in force at the date of such death, and the sum collected thereon (less ten cents per each member assessed for cost of collection) shall be paid—provided, however, that in no case shall the payment upon this Certificate in the event of such death exceed One Thousand Dollars (less Fifteen Dollars as a post mortem contribution to said Safety Fund, if the deceased member shall not have fully contributed therefor as hereinbefore required, together with any balance due said Company) to his legal

representatives within ninety days after the receipt of such proofs, on presentation and surrender of this Certificate. All such payments to be made at the Home Office of said Company in lawful money of the United States.

And said Company further agrees that such Mortuary Assessment shall be in no wise chargeable or liable for any use or purpose other than for the payment of Death Claims, except as above mentioned.

This Certificate is Issued by the Company and Accepted by the Member Upon the Following Express Conditions and Agreements:

1. Application Made Part of Contract.—The application on the basis of which this Certificate issues is hereby referred to and made a part of this contract.

2. Of Payments.—The person to whom this Certificate is issued agrees to pay to said Company Three Dollars per annum for expenses on the first day of the month after date of issue, and at every anniversary thereafter, so long as this Certificate shall remain in force; and to pay by monthly or other pro rata installments of the same in advance of periods of less than a year. And also agrees to pay said Company, upon each Certificate that shall become a claim, an assessment in accordance with the Table of Graduated Assessment Rates, as printed hereon, within thirty days from day on which notice bears date. And further agrees to pay said Company the sum of Ten Dollars towards Safety Fund, within sixty days from the date of issue of this Certificate, which will entitle the holder hereof to all the advantages under said fund, as set forth in the agreement with the Trustees aforesaid, a copy of which is printed hereon and hereby made a part of this contract; all such payments to be made direct to said Company. But with the written permission of said Company attached hereto, said payment required to be made towards the Safety Fund, or any part thereof, may be postponed and made payable at such other times as shall be named in such permission:

And, while the whole or any portion of such payment shall remain unpaid, said Company may apply any sum standing to the credit of this Certificate towards such payment.

3. Conditions of Acceptance.—The holder of this Certificate further agrees and accepts the same upon the express condition that if either the monthly dues, assessments, or the payment of the Ten Dollars towards the Safety Fund, as hereinbefore required, are not paid to said Company on the day due, then this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages or the recovery of any moneys paid for protection while the Certification was in force, either from said Company or the Trustees of the Safety Fund; and that if a legal and just claim to benefit, under the terms of this Certificate, shall arise before said Safety Fund shall have accumulated to Three Hundred Thousand Dollars, before January 1, 1885, and the sum collected on the assessment shall be made in such event shall be paid over, as hereinbefore stip-



ulated; or such claim shall arise after said Fund shall have accumulated to said amount, or after January 1, 1885, and this Certificate shall be fully settled and surrendered; or if any final division from said Safety Fund, as hereinbefore provided, shall be made by the Trustee thereof on account of this Certificate, then, in such cases, all liability of said Company and of its Safety Fund, on account of this Certificate, shall cease.

4. Mode of Giving Notice.—A printed or written notice, directed to the address of the member, as it appears at the time on the books of the Company, and deposited in the post office at Hartford, 154 or delivered by an agent of the Company, shall be deemed a legal and sufficient notice for all purposes hereof. A transcript of the books of said Company, certified by the Secretary, showing such facts, shall be taken and accepted as conclusive evidence of the mailing of such notice, and of the facts aforesaid, as set forth in such transcript.

5. Change of Residence or Address.—In case of change of residence, post office address, occupation, or name of the member, or his or her legal representatives, it is agreed on the part of the member that notice thereof in writing shall at once be given to the Secretary of the Company. In case of failure to do so, the Company may proceed for all purposes as if no such change had been made.

6. Prohibitions.—If the member named in this Certificate shall be personally engaged in blasting, submarine operations, mining under ground, manufacturing poisonous or explosive chemicals, "breaking" or "coupling" on, and "making-up" of, railroad trains, trading or living among savage tribes or nations, or shall be engaged in military or naval service (except in time of peace) without, in each of these cases, having first obtained the written consent of said Company, or shall use alcoholic or narcotic stimulants so as to produce intoxication sufficient to impair his or her health, or to produce delir-um tremens, or to cause his or her death, or shall die by self-destruction—feloniously or otherwise—or while intoxicated, or from effects of drunkenness, or in consequence of a duel, or of keeping or visiting unlawful or disreputable resorts, or the violation or attempted violation of the laws of any Nation, State, Province 155 or Municipality, or if there has been any concealment, misrepresentation, or false statement or statement not true made in the application on which this Certificate issues, or if the conditions herein shall not be in all respects observed and performed by the party to whom this Certificate issues; then, and in all such cases, this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages, or the recovery of any moneys paid thereon.

7. Travel and Residence.—The member herein named is at liberty to travel by railroad, sea, lake, or river, by all trains, first-class steamers, or sailing vessels, and to visit or reside in any portion of



the world other than the residence named in the application herefor, where inhabited and civilized, and free from epidemics, wars, or internal dissensions.

8. Limitation of Action.—It is expressly understood and agreed that no action shall be maintained, nor recovery had, for any claim on or by virtue of this Certificate, after the lapse of one year from the death of said member; and if no suit or proceedings for such recovery be commenced within one year from the date of death of said member it shall be deemed a waiver, on the part of all parties concerned, of all rights or claims under or by virtue of this Certificate, and as conclusive evidence against the validity of such claim, and this Certificate shall be null and void, and of no effect, and no person shall be entitled to damages or the recovery of any moneys paid thereon. And it is further expressly agreed, in case any suit or proceeding shall be commenced for the recovery of any claim under this Certificate after the lapse of one year from the death of said member, or when the claim is otherwise illegal or fraudulent, that the person or persons so commencing suit or proceeding, on failure to obtain judgment therefor, shall pay to said Company the sum of two hundred dollars, as its reasonable attorney's fees and damages, which sum shall be taxed as costs in the case, and shall be collected as other costs in the suit are collected.

9. Debts and Liens.—It is further agreed that this Certificate shall be charged with any and all amounts that may be owing from the member or beneficiary herein, or their assigns, to said Company at the time of the payment of this Certificate, and the Company reserves a lien thereon to secure the payment of any such indebtedness, and the right to deduct and withhold the amount of any such amount or indebtedness in payment thereof. And that in case any county, State, or Municipality in which the member of his legal representative may reside shall levy a tax to be paid by said Company on account of any moneys collected hereon, said member agrees to pay the amount of such tax to said Company in addition to the payments hereinbefore named, as part of the payments needed to keep this Certificate in force, upon notice and demand by said Company, either in connection with the payments of assessments and annual dues or otherwise, as said Company may from time to time elect.

10. Assignments.—This Certificate shall not be assigned or transferred, unless notice and copy of this assignment be given to said Company, nor, unless a claim hereunder, made by an assignee, be subject to proof of interest.

11. Powers of Agents.—Agents of the Company can not alter or vary any of the conditions of this Certificate, nor issue permits of any kind, and they are not authorized to make any indorsements thereon, nor to receive money or assessments, dues, or Safety Fund debts maturing and payable after the issue of this Certificate.

In Witness whereof, the said Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company have, by their President and Secretary, signed and

delivered this contract, at Hartford, Conn., this 4th day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two.

(Signed)

T. R. FOSTER,

[SEAL.]

*President.*

(Signed) W. A. COWLES,

*Ass. Secretary.*

(Agents of the Company are not authorized to make any indorsements on this certificate.)

*Trustee's Contract.*

This agreement, made and entered into this thirty-first day of December, A. D. 1879, by and between the Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Connecticut, and located in the City of Hartford in said State, party of the first part; and the Security Company, a like corporation also located at said Hartford, party of the second part; witnesseth:

158      Whereas, The party of the first part purposes to issue to persons contracting therefor, Certificates of membership in a special department of its business to be known as the Safety Fund Department, and, in consideration of the sum of ten dollars to be received on each one thousand dollars of the amount of each and every such Certificate for the purpose of creating a Safety Fund, to insert therein sundry agreements with such persons in the following words; to-wit:

"That said Company will deposit said sum of ten dollars, when" "received, with the Trustee, named in a contract made with it" "of which a copy is printed hereon), as a Safety Fund in trust" "for the uses and purposes expressed in said contract; and shall" "at the expiration of five years from July 1, 1879, if said Safety" "Fund shall then amount to three hundred thousand dollars, or" "whenever thereafter said sum shall be attained, make a semi-" "annual distribution of the net interest received therefrom by it," "pro rata among all the holders of Certificates in force in said de-" "partment at such times, who shall have contributed five years" "prior to the date of any such division their stipulated proportion" "of said Fund, by applying the same to the payment of their future" "dues and assessments; and that, whenever said Fund shall amount" "to one million dollars all subsequent receipts therefor shall be dis-" "tributed by the said Company in like manner as the interest."

"Said Company further agrees that if at any time, after said" "Fund shall have amounted to three hundred thousand dollars," "or after five years from January 1, 1880, if that amount"

159      "shall not have been attained before that date, it shall fail by" "reason of insufficient membership, or, shall neglect if and" "legally due, to pay the maximum indemnity provided for by the" "terms of any Certificates issued in said department, and such Cer-" "tificate shall be presented for payment to said Trustee by the legal"

"holder thereof, accompanied by satisfactory evidence, as herein-"  
 "after provided, of its failure to pay, after demand upon it within"  
 "the time herein stipulated for limitation of action, then it shall be"  
 "the duty of said Trustee to at once convert said Safety Fund into"  
 "money and distribute the same (less the reasonable charges and"  
 "expenses for the management and control of said Fund) among"  
 "all the holders of Certificates then in force in said department, or"  
 "their legal representatives, in the proportion which the amount of"  
 "each of their Certificates shall bear to the amount of the whole"  
 "number of such Certificates in force; and that in such event it"  
 "shall file with said Trustee a correct list, under oath, of the names,"  
 "residences and amounts of the Certificates of all members entitled"  
 "to participate in such division. The evidence referred to above to"  
 "be either certification by said Insurance Company's President or"  
 "Secretary that a claim is justly and legally due and that payment"  
 "thereof has been demanded and refused, or the duly attested copy"  
 "of a final judgment obtained thereupon in any court of competent"  
 "jurisdiction, satisfaction of which has been neglected or refused for"  
 "a period of sixty days from this date."

160 "And said Company further agrees that so long as any"  
 "Certificate of membership in its Safety Fund Department"  
 "shall remain in force, said Fund shall be in no wise chargeable or"  
 "liable for any use or purpose except as above mentioned."

Now, Therefore, the party of the first part, in consideration of the covenants and agreements hereinafter contained on the part of the party of the second part and in accordance with its agreement with its Certificate holders, as hereinbefore recited, does hereby appoint the party of the second part Trustee as aforesaid and covenants and agrees with it and its successors in said trust to deposit with said Trustee, as soon as received, the sum of ten dollars on each thousand dollars of the amount of each and every Certificate of membership issued by it in the aforesaid department until said Fund shall amount to one million dollars, to be by said Trustee held in trust and accumulated as hereinafter agreed, and the income thereof, less the reasonable compensation and expense of said trust, to be paid over to the party of the first part, as hereinafter provided, to be used by the party of the first part in accordance with the hereinbefore recited agreements: And when said Trustee shall pay the income, as above, to the party of the first part, or, shall make any other payments from said Fund, as required by the terms hereof, the liability of said Trustee on the amount so paid shall cease; it being understood and agreed that said Fund belongs to the party of the first part, subject to the expressed trusts herein provided.

161 And the party of the second part, for itself and its successors, in consideration of such deposits and of a reasonable compensation for its services, and the necessary expenses of managing said trust, covenants and agrees with the party of the first part and its successors, and with each of the holders of the aforesaid Certificates that it will receive, hold, manage and dispose of all said deposits made with it by said Insurance Company, principal and in-

come, in accordance with the uses and purposes specified in the hereinafore recited agreements of the party of the first part with its Certificate holders, and shall at all reasonable times exhibit to the party of the first part all the securities and investments composing said Trust Fund; and shall render true statements of the account of said funds and the income thereof to any person entitled to request the same by reason of an interest therein; said party of the first part hereby agreeing to keep the party of the second part correctly informed of the names, addresses, numbers and amounts of Certificates of all persons thus entitled.

That, as often as the sum composing such Fund shall be in amount sufficient to purchase one thousand dollars, par value, of United States Bonds, said Trustee shall make investments of such funds therein and register the same in its name as Trustee of the Safety Fund of the said Insurance Company, and, provided no default by the party of the first part as hereinafore recited shall occur, shall accumulate said Fund and the income thereof (less the reasonable compensation and expenses), for five years from July 1, 1879, or

162 until such time thereafter as such Fund shall amount to three hundred thousand dollars, par value, of the securities purchased for said Fund, when the party of the second part will pay over to the party of the first part, semi-annually thereafter, all the further income from said Fund (less the accruing and unpaid compensation and expenses), to be by the party of the first part used for the purposes mentioned in the hereinafore recited agreements: And, unless such default shall occur, will thereafter add to the principal of said Fund the deposits thereafter received from the party of the first part, exclusive of the income therefrom, until the whole Fund shall amount in such securities at their par value, to one million dollars: And in the event of the failure or neglect mentioned in the hereinafore recited agreements, will convert said Fund into money and distribute the same in accordance with the hereinafore recited agreements, as soon as can reasonably be done after the necessary information of the proper persons and their shares shall have been obtained: Said party of the first part hereby agreeing to put the party of the second part in possession of the information required for the making of a proper distribution thereof as agreed with its Certificate holders.

All payments required hereby to be made to the party of the first part to cease upon the aforesaid failure or neglect of the party of the first part: and all payments required herein to be made to the Certificate holders by the party of the second part to be made at the office of said Trustee or of the successor in said trust.

163 The necessary expenses connected with the management of said Fund shall be limited to the ordinary commissions for purchasing or selling and transfer or transmission of the hereinafore mentioned securities, together with the cost of the stationery and postage used in replying to requests for information of the condition of said Fund and the actual cost of any judicial action needed to determine the legal status of said Fund: All other expenses to be included in and covered by such reasonable charge as shall be made

for the compensation of the trusteeship, to be determined by the amount of time and labor involved in the execution thereof.

It is hereby mutually understood and agreed by both parties hereto that all the hereinbefore recited agreements of the party of the first part with the Certificate holders shall constitute the uses and purposes of the trust expressed herein. And it is hereby further understood and agreed that at such time as it shall be shown that all Certificates of membership issued by the party of the first part in its Safety Fund Department, have been legally settled and surrendered to it, or properly canceled in accordance with their terms, it shall be held and considered that the uses and purposes of said trust have been fully accomplished by said Insurance Company, and the balance of said Fund, if any, shall be paid over to the party of the first part.

And it is further understood and agreed that if said party of the second part shall, for any cause, fail to perform its duties as such Trustee as hereinbefore specified, or if, by reason of financial embarrassment of the party of the second part, or other cause, it shall be deemed expedient to remove said trust from its hands, then a new Trustee may be appointed, by the mutual nomination of said Insurance Company, and the then Insurance Commissioner of the State of Connecticut, to succeed to said trust, with all the duties and obligations herein imposed upon said original Trustee, and said party of the second part shall surrender said Fund to such successor.

In Witness Whereof, the party of the first part has affixed hereunto the corporate seal of said Insurance Company and caused these presents to be signed by its President and Secretary.

And the party of the second part has hereto affixed its corporate seal and its President and Treasurer have hereunto set their hands.

Done in duplicate at Hartford in the State of Connecticut the day and year first above written.

[SEAL.]

HARTFORD LIFE AND ANNUITY  
INS. CO.,

By E. H. CROSBY,  
*President, and*  
STEPHEN BALL,  
*Secretary.*

[SEAL.]

SECURITY COMPANY,  
By ROBERT E. DAY,  
*President, and*  
WILLIAM L. MATSON,  
*Treasurer.*

*Table of Graduated Assessment Rates for Death Losses for Every \$1,000 of a Total Indemnity of \$1,000,000.*

Age.	Rate.	Age.	Rate.	Age.	Rate.
15 to 21....	\$0.65	35....	\$0.97	48....	\$1.35
22....	.67	36....	1.00	49....	1.40
23....	.69	37....	1.03	50....	1.47
24....	.71	38....	1.06	51....	1.54
165					
25....	.73	39....	1.09	52....	1.63
26....	.75	40....	1.12	53....	1.72
27....	.77	41....	1.14	54....	1.81
28....	.79	42....	1.16	55....	1.92
29....	.81	43....	1.18	56....	2.03
30....	.83	44....	1.20	57....	2.15
31....	.85	45....	1.22	58....	2.32
32....	.88	46....	1.25	59....	2.50
33....	.91	47....	1.30	60....	2.68
34....	.94				

These rates decrease in proportion as the total indemnity in force increases above one million dollars in amount, and are calculated so as to cover the usual expense for collecting.

Received of The Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Company, of Hartford, Conn., —, in full for all claims under this Certificate, No. —, on the life of — — —, deceased.

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Beneficiary.

\_\_\_\_\_,  
Beneficiary.

Witness:

\_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_.

(Back of Policy.)

This Company has no agents authorized to receive money on Assessments, Dues, or Safety Fund.

66

No. 34501.

Safety Fund Department.

Certificate of Membership.

Benefit Not to Exceed \$3,000.

Issued by The

Hartford Life and Annuity Insurance Co.,

Hartford, Conn.

Name, Robert H. Langdale.  
Agent, B. F. Coon.

Read carefully all the conditions of this certificate.

No person should be a party to a contract without knowing all its conditions.

After an Agent has delivered this Certificate, and collected the Admission Fee, no other payment connected with the indemnity under this Certificate must be made to the agent without the production of a receipt signed by the Company's Secretary.

Always give number of this certificate in writing to home office.

Know All Men by These Presents, That the undersigned beneficiary— named in the within Certificate, issued to ——— in consideration of — have sold, assigned and conveyed to ———, of —, County of —, State of —, and to his heirs and assigns forever, all — right, title, and interest in the within Certificate of Membership, subject to the terms and conditions thereof.

I hereby constitute the said assignee or assignees its attorney, in my name, but to his own use, to take all legal measures which may be proper to keep in force said Certificate and finally collect all amounts due and to become due thereunder, with power of substitution.

Witness my hand and seal this — day of —, 18—.

———. [SEAL.]

If more than one beneficiary, they can sign below.

## "EXHIBIT D."

*Special Notice of Quarterly Call No. 100.*

Hartford Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

R. H. Langdale,  
N. E. Cor. 4th and Walnut St.,  
Room 9, Cincinnati, O.:

August 2nd, 1903.

30031-3.

This call, which will be due Sept. 1, 1903, is made to meet 132 deaths (as shown by accompanying list), benefits \$313,000 and expenses on your policy, as follows:

For Mortality Call.....	\$27.90
For quarterly dues to Dec. next.....	2.25
Credit .....	30.15
Dividend (to be applied if payment be made).....	2.10
Amount due .....	\$28.05

Payment will not be accepted later than Sept. 5, 1903, unless residence is on or west of the meridian of Salt Lake, Utah, in which case payment will be accepted up to and including Sept. 15, 1903.

Unless the payment called for by this notice shall be paid to the company at its home office by or before the day it falls due the policy and all payments thereon will become forfeited and void.

Return this notice with remittance payable to Hartford Life Insurance Company.

Make all remittances by draft, check, P. O. or express money order when possible. Letters containing currency must be registered.

Your next quarterly call will fall due and be payable Dec. 1, 1903.

*Special Notice.*

If the payment of the above quarterly call is not received at this office on or before \*Sept. 5, 1903, the last day allowed for payment in the above notice, a second notice will be mailed to the policy holder by registered letter, giving until \*Sept. 20, 1903, to remit, and the same charge will be made for this second notice as is fixed by the law of Massachusetts, namely, fifty cents.

Every member whose payment does not reach this office on or before \*Sept. 5, 1903, will be obliged to pay this fifty cent fee in order to have the policy unconditionally reinstated.

After \*Sept. 20, 1903, the limit allowed for payment under the registered notice, the company reserves the right to require a medical examination as a condition of reinstatement.

\*If residence is on or west of the meridian of Salt Lake, Utah, ten days' additional time is allowed.



## EXHIBIT "B."

*Depositions.*

Present on Behalf of Plaintiff: Smith W. Bennett.

Present on Behalf of Defendant: Harry B. Arnold.

Mr. Arnold: I wish to state on behalf of the defendant that we object to the jurisdiction of the court in this case and protest against the exercise of such jurisdiction herein, and appear here solely because we are forced to appear by the action of the court in these cases.

169       GEORGE D. FRY, of lawful age, being by me first duly sworn, as hereinafter certified, deposes and says as follows:

Direct examination.

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. 1. State your name.

A. George D. Fry.

Q. 2. Where do you reside?

A. 2320 North Fourth street, Columbus, Ohio.

Q. 3. Were you ever employed by the defendant, The Hartford Life Insurance Company? If so, when, and in what capacity?

A. As special agent, afterwards as general agent; in '83 as special.

Q. 4. How many years were you so employed?

A. About seven.

Q. 5. And what was your territory?

A. Ohio, southern Ohio.

Q. 6. Are you acquainted with the plaintiff?

A. I am.

Q. 7. Are you familiar with the terms of the policy that was held by the plaintiff in the defendant company?

A. I am.

Q. 8. Have you examined the table of rates on the back of this policy?

A. I have.

Q. 9. Now, referring to the table of graduated assessment rates for death losses for every \$1,000 of a total indemnity of \$1,000,000, I call to your attention the provision that after the policyholder arrives at the age of sixty years, the rate provided for therein shall be \$2.68. Are you familiar with that provision?

A. I am.

Q. 10. State whether there was any direction given you by the company, during the period of your service with them, with  
170 reference to that table of rates or any attempted changes therein.

A. To the best of my knowledge there was a change made in the rate in '81.

Q. 11. That is, the year 1881?

A. 1881.

Q. 12. State what that change was.

A. The change was from—graduated from 65 to 60. That change was made in '81.

Q. 13. And state what that provision was.

A. They were graduated to 60 years only. \$2.68 at 60 years of age. That was written part of '81, all of the year '82, and up to about June of '83.

Q. 14. How was that change evidenced, if at all? By endorsement on the policy or otherwise?

A. By endorsement on the policy.

Q. 15. You may state whether there was any agreement on the part of the plaintiff with regard to that change.

A. None whatever.

Q. 16. State if there was a slip or rider to be attached to the policy presented by you to the plaintiff.

A. There was.

Q. 17. What was the purpose of the presentation to the plaintiff by you?

A. To have them agree to the \$4.00 rate.

Q. 18. Did he so agree?

A. Quite a number agreed; others refused.

Q. 19. Did this particular plaintiff ever agree?

A. No; never did.

Q. 20. State whether you presented such slip or rider to the plaintiff, and if so for what purpose?

A. I presented the slip to the plaintiff, but they objected to signing it, that is, his consent to pay \$4.00 instead of \$2.68.

171 Q. 21. From whom had you received such slips or riders?

A. From the company.

Q. 22. How were they delivered to you?

A. I received them by mail.

Q. 23. Under whose direction were you acting in thus presenting these slips or riders?

A. The president of the company.

Q. 24. What was his name—at that time?

A. George E. Keeney.

Q. 25. I hand you here what purports to be a duplicate copy of such slips or riders, which the stenographer has marked "Exhibit A," and ask you if that is a true copy of the original presented to plaintiff?

A. It is.

Q. 26. What were your instructions from President Keeney with regard to such slips or riders?

A. To secure their signatures.

Q. 27. State whether you made any report to the company of your success or failure in obtaining their signatures to such slips or riders.

A. I mailed in the original to the company. Each signature as secured was mailed in to the company.

Q. 28. Do you know what the company thereafter did with such slips as you mailed in?

A. Put them on file in their home office.

Q. 29. Did you thereafter call at the home office of the company in Hartford, Connecticut?

A. I did.

Q. 30. Mr. Fry, there are now five cases pending in the Court of Common Pleas of Franklin county, Ohio, in which the following persons are plaintiffs: Otto E. K. Ruhrmann, Robert H. Langdale, Alonzo J. Doud, Paul Hitchcock et al., administrators of the estate of William H. Hitchcock, and I. D. Fry. State whether or not you were acquainted with each of the said plaintiffs during their lifetime; and, if any of them have deceased, state which ones.

A. Well acquainted with all. They are all alive with one exception, I. D. Fry. They are all living today, with one exception—and William Hitchcock, excuse me—the two.

Q. 31. I. D. Fry and William Hitchcock?

A. I. D. Fry and William Hitchcock.

Q. 32. State if you were the agent of the defendant company that issued the policies to any of these plaintiffs. Well, in other words, if you were the agent that sold the insurance to these plaintiffs.

A. I did not sell all of these plaintiffs.

Q. 33. State which ones you did sell.

A. I sold I. D. Fry. I am not sure as to Ruhrmann whether it was Sulzer or who placed his application; that came through the Cincinnati agency at the time. Mr. Langdale, I think, was written by Mr. Mosher; I couldn't say without seeing their contract. They had the agent's name—

Q. 34. I am only asking, Mr. Fry, as to the particular ones that you wrote.

A. Well, I. D. Fry is the only particular one, I think of the ones there.

Q. 35. I. D. Fry?

A. I. D. Fry.

Q. 36. State whether or not you called upon each of these plaintiffs with regard to executing these slips.

A. I did.

Q. 37. Now, Mr. Fry, do you know what the company did with regard to the amounts of the assessments on these plaintiffs' policies after you had failed to get their signatures on the slips?

A. They charged them all the \$4.00 rate.

Q. 38. Did you have any conversation with the president or secretary of the company relative thereto?

A. I received my instructions in regard to these slips.

Q. 39. I mean relative to the change of practice by which they were all to be assessed at a uniform rate?

A. That was brought up through the department here; called to the president's attention—to that fact that they were discriminating.

Q. 40. When you speak of the department here, what department do you refer to?

A. The insurance department of the state.

Q. 41. Who was the superintendent of insurance at the time?

A. Mr. A. I. Vorys.

Q. 42. And what did the company thereafter do with regard to charging the higher rate, or assessing the higher rate?

A. They tried to secure their signatures to grant them that permission after this question was raised.

Q. 43. You mean after the question was raised by the insurance department of the state?

A. Yes.

Q. 44. And thereafter what was done by the defendant company?

A. I called on these parties to secure their signatures to the agreement to the increase.

Q. 45. With what success?

A. Well, I had a great many to sign them and agree to it.

Q. 46. Thereafter was the assessment at the \$4.00 rate made uniform?

A. It was made uniform—they were assessing them the \$4.00 rate when this question was raised in regard to making it uniform; they were to assess them all the same whether they had a right to or not.

174 Q. 47. Well, thereafter did the company continue to assess them at the \$4.00 rate or at what rate?

A. They did.

Q. 48. Do you know Charles H. Bacall?

A. I never met Mr. Bacall.

Q. 49. Do you know what position he held?

A. He was secretary of the company.

Q. 50. Of the defendant company?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. 51. Do you know whether any parties, not meaning the plaintiff, had been rebated by the company any amounts, and if so, what?

A. There were several rebates. Mr. Schultz, the importer, was paid—he received \$270 rebate.

Q. 52. Rebate of what?

A. Of the overcharge.

Q. 53. Overcharge on what?

A. The rate, from the two sixty-eight, increased to \$4.00; two sixty-eight to \$4.00.

Q. 54. How do you know of that rebate having been paid?

A. Why, he showed me the letter of his secretary.

Q. 55. Do you know whether that was done by order of the company or any of its officers?

A. It was done by order of Stephen Ball, who was then secretary.

Q. 56. About what time was that?

A. It was about April 29, '91, that office used to assess him from that date on at the \$2.68 rate instead of \$4.00.

(By Mr. Arnold:)

Q. What was his name?

A. J. F. Schultz; he is now deceased.

175 Q. 57. Do you know of any other instances of that kind?

A. I know Mr. Gordon was rebated by Mr. Charles H.

Bacall.

Q. 58. Do you know the amount of the rebate?

A. I do not remember the amount.

(By Mr. Arnold:)

Q. What is his name?

A. W. J. M. Gordon; he is now deceased.

Q. 59. Now, Mr. Fry, were you and are you familiar with the rule by which the defendant company made computation of the amount of assessment per thousand of insurance? I am not asking you what the rule was, but whether you are familiar with such rule?

A. Yes; yes, sir.

Q. 60. Have you made a computation of the amounts of the assessments paid by Mr. Alonzo J. Doud after he arrived at the age of 60; I mean, if the difference between the \$2.68 rate and the \$4.00 rate?

A. I did.

Q. 61. In making such computation, state what rule you observed.

A. I observed the rule of the company; the ratio and the rule of deaths per table rate; the mortality to the ratio.

Q. 62. Have you the amounts of such computation with you?

A. No; I have the ratios with me, what the company issues, showing what they charged from the beginning to the present.

Q. 63. No, I mean have you now in your possession the result of your computation?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. 64. Now, you may state with regard to the Doud policy from what period you have made such computation?

A. From the attained age of 60 to the—I forgot the date—up to his last assessment.

176 Q. —. I hand you a paper, which for purposes of identification I have marked "Exhibit B," and ask you what that paper is.

A. That shows the overcharge from \$2.68 to \$4.00 rate.

Q. 66. And who made the computation therein contained?

A. I did.

Q. 67. That is, that computation down to the last assessment?

A. That was for the last assessment he paid. It was assessment call No. 152, inclusive, 152.

Q. 68. In the case of Mr. Doud, state what was done with his policy?

A. Mr. Doud still holds his policy; it is in his possession.

Q. 69. Do you know whether it is kept in force or not?

A. It is.

Q. 70. How much, if at all, should be added to that for each assessment or for each call after No. 152?

A. There should be added the additional assessments and the interest.

Q. 71. Will you have attached as part of your deposition the Exhibit A heretofore referred to as the slip or rider?

A. I will.

Q. 72. Will you have attached to your deposition as part thereof, a copy of the computation made by you under mark of Exhibit B?

A. I will.

The Exhibit A so identified is herewith presented to the notary and attached hereto, as marked by the stenographer.

Exhibit B so identified is herewith presented to the notary and attached hereto, as marked by the stenographer.

177 Cross-examination.

By Mr. H. B. Arnold:

X Q. 1. Are you related to the late George D. Fry, the plaintiff in case No. 74211?

A. That is I. D. Fry?

X Q. 2. I. D. Fry?

A. Brother.

X Q. 3. When did you first become connected with the Hartford Life?

A. In '82.

X Q. 4. You say you were special agent?

A. I was special agent at that time, and then I succeeded J. A. Sulzer, general agent, Cincinnati.

X Q. 5. You say you were special agent. Does that mean soliciting agent?

A. Soliciting agent.

X Q. 6. You say the rate was changed in 1881?

A. That was before I was with the company. They were writing this policy when I first wrote the business.

X Q. 7. You mean in '82 they were writing the present policy?

A. They were writing this two sixty-eight rate.

X Q. 8. Your information as to the change in '81 was gotten from what somebody else told you?

A. I got it off the record at Hartford, Connecticut.

X Q. 9. You say the change was evidenced by endorsement. You mean a different table of rates, or the contents of the table, on a certificate or in the body of the certificate?

A. In the body of the certificate.

X Q. 10. It was evidenced by the change in the language on the written contracts?

A. By those following this rebate and were so recognized by Stephan Ball as correct.

X Q. 11. You say you had instructions as to these riders. Were they contained in letters written to you?

178 A. They were given me by General Keeney, George E. Keeney.

X Q. 12. By letter?

A. In person. We had some correspondence afterwards. Quite a few letters passed between us.

X Q. 13. You said also you made reports. Those were written reports, I take it?

A. What was that question?

X Q. 14. Those were written reports?

A. They were all printed and signed by these insured members.

X Q. 15. Then the reports you made were by mail, by letter?

A. By letter.

X Q. 16. You spoke of a so-called rebate to J. F. Schultz. The information you say about that was the letter you said he showed to you?

A. The letter—not only the letter he showed to me, Mosher, who wrote it, Will Mosher, the general agent, spoke of this change in the contract and he wrote the company in regard to Schultz.

X Q. 17. What I mean: You personally did not make the rebate or have a personal knowledge of that rebate to Mr. Schultz?

A. I did not; that is over the secretary's signature.

X Q. 18. And the same is true as to Mr. Gordon?

A. Mr. Gordon. It is all on file at the home office.

X Q. 19. In this computation in Exhibit B, please explain how you arrived at the so-called overcharge.

A. This was the assessment the company sent out. These were the assessments that the company sent out.

X Q. 20. That is under the heading "Assessments"?

179 A. Under the head "Assessment." Call number so and so; quarterly call; they assessed this party \$27.89, calculated at \$4.00, you see. I calculated at \$2.86. The \$2.86 shows an overcharge of \$1.76. Instead of \$27.89 it should be \$26.13.

X Q. 21. Arriving at that, what method do you use?

A. I mean \$2.68 instead of \$2.86.

X Q. 22. What method do you use in arriving at that twenty-six thirteen?

A. Why, simply—that mortality ratio was simply \$3.25 per death; now they charged \$3.25 on that table rate; \$2.68; they calculated that at \$4 which their policy did not call for.

X Q. 23. I want you to just state, Mr. Fry, what figures you used in getting that result twenty-six thirteen in that column?

A. By computing the age ratio with the mortality ratio; that is the same mortality ratio that they used in obtaining this. I simply took the age ratio and the mortality ratio, the age ratio according to this contract; they changed it to \$4.00.

X Q. 24. What did you do then? You took the age ratio and the mortality ratio—

A. Why just multiplied the age ratio with the mortality ratio.

X Q. 25. Where did you get the mortality ratio?

A. From the company's call.

X Q. 26. Then by what method do you arrive at twenty-six thirteen?

A. Just according to their rule.

X Q. 27. I mean, what do you do here, multiply, or divide, or subtract—

A. I multiplied this mortality ratio with the age ratio.

X Q. 28. That is, you took the age ratio and multiplied that with the mortality ratio which the company had used?

A. Yes.

180 X Q. 29. And then multiplied that by the amount of the insurance?

A. No, I didn't—that is all the multiplying there was—the difference—I will show you here. The company sent out a call, twenty-seven eighty-nine. Now, here—I got on the wrong one. These steps are the age from two sixty-eight, you see. The charge at 60 is graduated to two sixty-eight. Now then coming 61 they charged him three nought eight instead of two eighty-six. September call was calculated at two eighty-six, steps a few cents each call.

X Q. 30. Then I understand you that, for instance, taking, on Exhibit A the assessment on call 117, you take two sixty-eight, multiply that by the mortality ratio of three—

A. Three deaths—

X Q. 31. And then multiply that age by the three thousand—

A. The amount he holds.

X Q. 32. You arrive at the result of twenty-four twelve?

A. I do.

Mr. Arnold: That is all I want to get at.

Re-examination.

By Mr. Bennett:

R. X 1. If you have with you a rule obtained from the defendant company, of which such computation is made, state what it is—what that rule is.

A. It is contained in the following slip, which is marked by the stenographer "Exhibit C."

R. X 2. Where did you get the printed slip of which you have a copy, which is hereto attached, marked "Exhibit C?"

A. They were mailed out by the secretary of the company.

181 R. X 3. And your computation attached hereto, marked "Exhibit B," state whether that is computed under that rule?

A. It is.

R. X 4. Did I understand you that the amount of the computation is based upon the difference between the rate at the attained age of 60 at \$2.68 and the amount of \$4.00 as actually assessed by the company; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

GEORGE D. FRY.



## EXHIBIT "A."

Duplicate.

In consideration of the Hartford Life Insurance Company assessing my certificate No. — quarterly, and for the purpose of determining the amount of any quarterly assessment, including my said certificate with all certificates then in force in the Safety Fund Department issued prior to my said certificate and with tables of rates to age sixty-five, I hereby ratify and consent to the method heretofore employed by said company in determining the assessments on my said certificate and agree that the said company shall, in future, levy assessments against my certificate, in the same manner, and for like amount at the same attained age, as shall be levied against the aforesaid certificates issued prior to my said certificate.

Dated at ——— this — day of ——— 19—.

—————

## EXHIBIT B.

## Langdale.

Date.	Quarterly call.	Amt. of insurance.	Age ratio.	Mortality ratio.	Assessments.	Overcharge.	Interest.
1903.							
September .....	100	\$3,000	\$2.86	\$3.25	\$27.89	\$1.76	\$1.37
December .....	101	3,000	2.86	2.80	24.03	1.51	1.18
1904.							
March .....	102	3,000	2.86	3.30	28.31	1.78	1.28
June .....	103	3,000	3.08	3.80	32.58	4.55	3.28
September .....	104	3,000	3.08	3.80	35.11	4.55	3.28
December .....	105	3,000	3.08	3.60	33.27	4.32	3.11
1905.							
March .....	106	3,000	3.08	3.60	33.27	4.32	2.85
June .....	107	3,000	3.30	3.80	37.62	7.07	4.67
September .....	108	3,000	3.30	3.60	35.64	6.71	4.43
December .....	109	3,000	3.30	3.80	37.62	7.07	4.67
1906.							
March .....	110	3,000	3.30	3.80	37.62	7.07	4.24
June .....	111	3,000	3.65	3.50	38.32	10.18	6.11
September .....	112	3,000	3.65	3.75	41.06	10.91	6.55
December .....	113	3,000	3.65	3.20	35.04	9.31	5.59

## 1907.

March .....	114	3,000	3.65	3.50	38.32	28.14	10.18	5.50
June .....	115	3,000	4.00	3.55	42.60	28.54	14.06	7.59
September .....	116	3,000	4.00	3.20	38.40	25.73	12.67	6.84
December .....	117	3,000	4.00	3.00	36.00	24.12	11.88	6.42

## 1908.

March .....	118	3,000	4.00	3.20	38.40	25.73	12.67	6.08
June .....	119	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	30.55	15.05	7.22
September .....	120	3,000	4.00	3.60	43.20	28.94	14.26	6.84
December .....	121	3,000	4.00	3.30	39.60	26.53	13.07	6.27

183

## 1909.

March .....	122	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	30.55	15.05	6.32
June .....	123	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	30.55	15.05	6.32
September .....	124	3,000	4.00	3.80	45.60	30.55	15.05	6.32
December .....	125	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	33.77	16.63	6.98

## 1910.

March .....	126	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	33.77	16.63	5.99
June .....	127	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	33.77	16.63	5.99
September .....	128	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	33.77	16.63	5.99
December .....	129	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	33.77	16.63	5.99

## EXHIBIT B.—Continued.

Date.	Quarterly call.	Amt. of insurance.	Age ratio.	Mortality ratio.	Assessments.	Overcharge.	Interest.
1911.							
March .....	130	3,000	4.00	4.40	52.80	17.42	5.23
June .....	131	3,000	4.00	4.40	52.80	17.42	5.23
September .....	132	3,000	4.00	4.20	50.40	16.63	4.99
December ... ..	133	3,000	4.00	4.35	52.20	17.23	5.17
1912.							
March .....	134	3,000	4.00	3.95	47.40	15.64	3.75
June .....	135	3,000	4.00	5.65	67.80	22.37	5.37
September .....	136	3,000	4.00	5.15	61.80	20.39	4.89
December .....	137	3,000	4.00	3.77	45.24	14.93	3.58
1913.							
March .....	138	3,000	4.00	3.95	47.40	15.64	2.82
June .....	139	3,000	4.00	5.94	71.28	23.52	4.23
September .....	140	3,000	4.00	4.86	58.32	19.25	3.46
December .....	141	3,000	4.00	4.10	49.20	16.24	2.92
1914.							
March .....	142	3,000	4.00	5.63	67.56	22.29	2.67
Interest .....						\$552.22	\$209.58
						209.58	
						\$761.80	

184

## EXHIBIT "C."

The amount of each call in the Safety Fund Department is determined as follows:

By an accurate calculation, the exact amount which will be produced by the assessment of one rate, as illustrated in the table of graduated assessment rates on the back of the certificate, at the attained age of each member whose certificate is in force, is ascertained.

This sum is then divided into the whole amount of death claims which have accrued in the quarter, and the quotient is the factor which we call the ratio. The ratio is the number of times the rate which it is necessary for each member to pay in order to make up the full sum of death claims approved, due allowance being made for lapses. The rate increases with the advancing age each year up to the age of 65. Beyond that age the rate for the ages does not increase, and any variation in the assessment is due to a variation in mortality.

E. R. INGRAHAM,  
*Secretary.*

(Over)

## Men's Division.

Call No.	Date.	Ratio.
101.	Nov., 1903.....	2.8
102.	Feb., 1904.....	3.3
103.	May, 1904.....	3.8
104.	Aug., 1904.....	3.8
105.	Nov., 1904.....	3.6
106.	Feb., 1905.....	3.6
107.	May, 1905.....	3.8
108.	Aug., 1905.....	3.6

185

109.	Nov., 1905.....	3.8
110.	Feb., 1906.....	3.8
111.	May, 1906.....	3.5
112.	Aug., 1906.....	3.75
113.	Nov., 1906.....	3.20
114.	Feb., 1907.....	3.50
115.	May, 1907.....	3.55
116.	Aug., 1907.....	3.20
117.	Nov., 1907.....	3
118.	Feb., 1908.....	3.20
119.	May, 1908.....	3.80
120.	Aug., 1908.....	3.60
121.	Nov., 1908.....	3.30
122.	Feb., 1909.....	3.80
123.	May, 1909.....	3.80
124.	Aug., 1909.....	3.80
125.	Nov., 1909.....	4.20

Call No.	Date.	Ratio.
126.	Feb., 1910.....	4.2
127.	May, 1910.....	4.2
128.	Aug., 1910.....	4.2
129.	Nov., 1910.....	4.2
130.	Feb., 1911.....	4.4
131.	May, 1911.....	4.4
132.	Aug., 1911.....	4.2
133.	Nov., 1911.....	4.3
134.	Feb., 1912.....	3.9
135.	May, 1912.....	5.6
136.	Aug., 1912.....	5.1
137.	Nov., 1912.....	3.7
138.	Feb., 1913.....	3.9
139.	May, 1913.....	5.9

[Certificate attached.]

186 Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, January Term, A.  
1921.

(Minute Book No. 35, Page 634.)

Number: 16834.

Title of Case.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff in Error.

v.

ROBERT H. LANGDALE, Defendant in Error.

Action: Motion for an Order Directing the Court of Appeals  
Franklin County to Certify Its Record.

Error to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County.

Attorneys:

Arnold & Game, Columbus, Ohio; Jones, Hocker, Sullivan  
Angert, St. Louis, Mo., for plaintiff in error.

Bennett, Westfall & Bennett, Columbus, attorney- for defendant  
error.

*Transcript of Docket Entries, Memoranda of Pleadings, etc., Filed  
Writs Issued, Judgments, Orders, and Decrees.*

1920.

Nov. 16. Motion for an order directing the Court of Appeals to  
certify its record and proof of service filed.

" 16. Stipulation that briefs filed in No. 16833, be used in the  
case, filed.

- Nov. 27. Plaintiff's printed briefs filed in No. 16833.  
 " 30. Petition in error (as of right) and waiver of summons filed.  
 " " Court of Appeals transcript, original papers and bill of exceptions filed.  
 Dec. 1. Papers and motion taken by Toothaker & Rodenfels.  
 " 1. Proof of service of plaintiff's briefs filed.  
 " 14. Papers returned by Toothaker & Rodenfels.  
 " 17. Defendant's printed briefs on motion to certify record and on merits of case filed.  
 " 18. Printed record filed. 12/20/20, proof of service filed.  
 " 30. Plaintiff's printed brief (16833-16834) filed. 1/3/21 proof of service filed.  
 1921.  
 Nov. 15. Judgment Affirmed. (Journal No. 29, page 46.)  
 " 16. Printer's bill filed.  
 " 19. Mandate issued.  
 " 19. Original Papers and bill of exceptions sent to Clerk.  
 " 26. Receipt for papers filed.

187 *Transcript of Journal Entries.*

No. 16834.

THE HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

v.

ROBERT H. LANGDALE.

"Error to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County.

Nov. 15th, 1921.

"This cause came on to be heard upon the transcript of the record of the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals be, and the same is hereby, affirmed for the reasons stated in the opinion this day filed in Cause No. 16833—The Hartford Life Insurance Company v. Alonzo J. Douds—and on the authority of that case; and it appearing to the Court that there were reasonable grounds for this proceeding in error, it is ordered that no penalty be assessed herein. It is further ordered that a special mandate be sent to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County to carry this judgment into execution.

(Journal No. 29, page 46.)

188

## Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

STATE OF OHIO,

*City of Columbus, ss:*

I, Wilbur C. Lawrence, Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of docket and journal entries is truly taken and correctly copied from the records of said Court.

I further certify that the printed copy of the record attached hereto is a true and correct copy of the record and proceedings filed in said cause in the Supreme Court of Ohio.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my — and affixed the Seal of the Supreme Court of Ohio, this 27th day of December, A. D. 1921.

[Seal of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.]

WILBUR C. LAWRENCE,

*Clerk Supreme Court of Ohio.*

By SEBA H. MILLER,

*Deputy.*

189

STATE OF OHIO,

*City of Columbus:*

Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, of the Term of January, A. D. 1921.

I, J. L. W. Henney, Reporter of the Supreme Court of Ohio, do hereby certify that no opinion, other than the journal entry certified by the Clerk of this Court, accompanied the decision of the Supreme Court of Ohio in Cause No. 16834, The Hartford Life Insurance Company v. Robert H. Langdale.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Seal of said Supreme Court this 21st day of December, A. D., 1921.

[Seal of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.]

J. L. W. HENNEY,

*Reporter.*

190

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ss:

[Seal of the Supreme Court of the United States.]

The President of the United States of America to the Honorable the Judges of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, Greeting:

Being informed that there is now pending before you a suit in which The Hartford Life Insurance Company is plaintiff in error, and Robert H. Langdale is defendant in error, No. 16834, which suit was removed into the said Supreme Court by virtue of a writ of error



to the Court of Appeals of Franklin County, and we, being willing for certain reasons that the said cause and the record and proceedings therein should be certified by the said Supreme Court and removed into the Supreme Court of the United States, do hereby com-  
 191 mand you that you send without delay to the said Supreme Court, as aforesaid, the record and proceedings in said cause, so that the said Supreme Court may act thereon as of right and according to law ought to be done.

Witness the Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice of the United States, the sixth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

WM. R. STANSBURY,

*Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.*

192 [Endorsed:] File No. 28711. Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1921. No. 756. Hartford Life Insurance Company vs. Robert H. Langdale. Writ of Certiorari. Filed in Supreme Court of Ohio Apr. 25, 1922. Wilbur C. Lawrence, Clerk, by Seba H. Miller, Deputy.

193 I, Wilbur C. Lawrence, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true and complete copy of the stipulation of the parties as to return to be made to the writ of certiorari in the case of Hartford Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Robert H. Langdale, Defendant in Error, No. 16834, as fully and completely as said stipulation remains on file in my office.

In witness whereof, I have hereto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio at my office in the City of Columbus, Ohio, this 25th day of April, 1922.

[Seal of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.]

WILBUR C. LAWRENCE,

*Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio,*

By SEBA H. MILLER,

*Deputy Clerk.*

194 In the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

No. 16834.

HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff in Error,

vs.

ROBERT H. LANGDALE, Defendant in Error.

It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and between the parties to the above entitled cause that the certified transcript of record prepared by the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio and filed with the

petition for writ of certiorari, and now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, shall stand as the return of said Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio to the writ of certiorari, without the preparation of another transcript, and to this end it shall only be necessary for said Clerk to transmit to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court a certified copy of this stipulation as his return to the writ of certiorari.

HARRY B. ARNOLD,  
JAMES C. JONES,  
FRANK H. SULLIVAN,  
JAMES C. JONES, JR.,  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff in Error.*  
SMITH W. BENNETT,  
*Attorney for Defendant in Error.*

195

*Return to Writ of Certiorari.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*State of Ohio, ss:*

In obedience to the command of the within writ of certiorari, and in pursuance of the stipulation of the parties, a full, true and complete copy of which is hereto attached, I hereby certify that the transcript of record filed with the petition for a writ of certiorari in the case of Hartford Life Insurance Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. Robert H. Langdale, Defendant in Error, No. 16834, is a full, true and complete transcript of all the pleadings, proceedings and record entries in said cause as mentioned in the certificate hereto.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio at office in the City of Columbus, Ohio, this 25th day of April, 1922.

[Seal of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.]

WILBUR C. LAWRENCE,  
*Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio,*  
By SEBA H. MILLER,  
*Deputy Clerk.*

196 [Endorsed:] File No. 28,711. Supreme Court U. S. October Term, 1921. Term No. 756. Hartford Life Insurance Co., Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Langdale. Writ of certiorari and return. Filed April 29, 1922.